

THE
L I F E
O F
J U L I A N
The A P O S T A T E.

Translated from the FRENCH
of F. LA BLETTERIE.

And improved with

DISSERTATIONS on several
Points relating to J U L I A N's
Character, and to the History of the
fourth Century.

By V. DESVOEUX, Chaplain to the
Regiment of the King's Carabiniers.

Elzevir VOL. II. *De la Haye*

D U B L I N:

Printed by S. POWELL,

For PETER WILSON, at Gay's-Head, op-
posite to the Spring-Garden in Dame street.

M D C C X L V I.

1607/5418.



CONTENTS.

D I S S E R T A T I O N I
Upon the outward State of Christi-
 anity when Julian came to the
 Imperial Throne. Page 13

D I S S E R T A T I O N II
 Upon the Dissentions between the Ortho-
 dox and the Arians in Julian's Time. 67

D I S S E R T A T I O N III
 Upon Julian's real Sentiments on Re-
 ligion. 95

D I S S E R T A T I O N IV
 Upon the Principles of Religion which
 a Julian

CONTENTS.

Julian imbibed from his first Education under Mardonius. Page 132

DISSERTATION V.

Upon the Law made, and Laws supposed to have been made, by Julian; in order to restrain the Christians from studying liberal Sciences. 159

DISSERTATION VI.

On the particular favour shewn by Julian to some Hierarchy. 189

DISSERTATION VII.

Upon the Opinion the Pagan Philosophers at Julian's time had of the Religion they professed. 216

The Doctrine of antient Philosophers concerning the Unity of God. 246

The Distinction between the Exoteric and the Esoteric Doctrine of the Philosophers examined. 258

The case of the Philosophers initiation to the Mysteries. 282

The Philosophers Apologies for Paganism. 304

P R E-

PREFACE.

TH E design of the following Dissertations is neither to praise nor to blame *Julian*. If, by the inquiries I have made, that Prince appears either more or less praise-worthy or odious than he did before, it is the result of facts, not of any view I had to make him appear in that light. My aim in making these researches was to know, and in publishing them to make known, the most inveterate Enemy our Religion ever had. Those who imagine this is a trifling subject, and which does not deserve the attention of the Public, may enjoy their own judgment. For my part, as I look upon every thing as important, that may serve the cause of Christianity, I thought it no ways indiffe-

iv P R E F A C E.

rent to know the true Character and real Principles of one who is reported to have had nothing so much at heart as the extinction of it. The Deists and other Pretenders to Free-thinking who, for all they say against prejudice, magnify their own numbers as much as they can, are very apt to impose upon the World by false Muster-Rolls; and I am afraid they have been but too much countenanced in that foul practice, by suspicions thrown at random upon the sincerity of several great Men's Religion, in whose favour I have often wished some learned Man would undertake something like what the celebrated *Gabriel Naudé* performed in behalf of those accused of Magics. I think it might also be of service to shew the novelty of Deism; or that a Religion without Revelation is altogether without precedent in Antiquity, those who have opposed the *Jewish* or *Christian* Religions having constantly done it upon the principles of Superstition and pretended Revelations, which was in particular the Case of *Julian*.

However,

P R E F A C E. v

However, as Historical matters are necessarily linked together, this main design has led me into inquiries which, at first sight, seemed foreign to my purpose ; but which, I hope, will not be displeasing to the Readers. I have examined, and endeavoured to clear up, several important points of Ecclesiastical, Civil, and Literary History which do not immediately concern *Julian*, but serve to penetrate into the motives of his behaviour, and consequently to display his Character. Thus I have treated subjects which may render this Volume entertaining even for those who care the least for *Julian*. Independently of that Prince, one may be glad to examine what proportion the Christians bore to the Pagans in the fourth Century ; when the *Roman* Armies and Senate embraced Christianity ; Who were among the Christians the first introducers of the Antichristian practice of Persecuting ; How quick and dreadful progress the persecuting spirit made ; How great a length it carried those who were animated by it ; What sort of Christians were they who first attacked Mysteries ; How near their

VI P R E F A C E.

System was related to that of the Pagan Philosophers ; And other questions treated in the first, second, and sixth Dissertations. Independently of *Julian*, it is certain that the Sentiments of the Gentile Philosophers, concerning the Religion they professed, make a considerable, and perhaps not the less curious part of antient Litterary History ; and the lovers of Antiquity will not, I hope, look upon my seventh Dissertation, wherein that subject is treated, as the least interesting of the Work.

I might have given a further scope to my observations on several heads, as the distinction between the *Exoteric* and *Esoteric* Doctrine of the Philosophers, the *Mysteries* of Paganism, the arguments made use of to put a gloss over the most shocking absurdities of the Heathenish Theology, &c. but was forced to contract the matters, lest the Book should swell to too considerable a size. This was also my reason for leaving out many original Authorities, which the Reader may observe are fewer in the Margin after p. 132 than before, and a whole

Dissertation

P R E F A C E. vii

Dissertation upon Theurgy, (which I may perhaps publish hereafter in another shape) besides several remarks either upon F. *La Bletterie's* Life of *Julian*, or upon mistakes committed by Authors who spoke of that Emperor without having sufficiently examined the subject they were speaking of. I shall mention only two of those mistakes which may serve to warn the Reader not to have too great a dependance upon a kind of books, which many People are apt to look upon as sure repertories of Learning.

The first is an odd observation made by † one of the Authors of the *Journal Litteraire* of *Hague* in 1736. According to F. la Bletterie, says he, *Julian lived no more than thirty-two Years, and reigned very little above two. The Medals of that Prince represent him as a Man of forty at least,*
and

† T. XXIII. p. 220. It must be observed that the Society of Learned Men who wrote a Journal under that Title from the beginning of 1729 till June 1732, having then ceased to be the Authors of it, the Bookseller supplied the want of such able Hands with those he could procure.

viii P R E F A C E.

and suppose he has reigned above ten Years. We are not told how the Author came by that rare discovery, which contradicts all the Monuments of *Julian's* Age ; but as, † in other places, he takes *F. Hardeuin* for his only Guide in point of History, and adopts the most extravagant Notions of that whimsical Learned Man, there is reason to think he has been misled by that Jesuit, who † really makes *Julian* to sit on the Imperial Throne for twenty Years ; ten jointly with *Constantius*, and ten more after *Constantius's* Death. However, had he been as well acquainted with Medals as he woud be thought to be, he might have known that there is no judgment to be made of an ugly Man's Age, such as *Julian* was, by the features of his Face, as imprinted on a Medal ; and coud never have been ignorant of what the celebrated *Noris* has observed concerning some Medals

† See T. XXII. 1 part. p. 155. 2 part. p. 265. 270.

† *Hard. Op. Select.* p. 118. *Nummi Antiq. Illustrati.*

P R E F A C E. ix

Medals which seem to assign to several Emperors, who continued but very little time on the Throne, a Reign of ten or twenty years; that the Inscriptions of these Medals must be understood of ten or twenty years to come at the time they were struck, not of such a term already elapsed. All these Medals, says the learned Cardinal, after quoting several of different Emperors, † have the Words VOTIS DECENNALIBUS, *tho' none of these Emperors ever lived to sit four years on the Throne, and some not above a few months, from whence we infer that the above Inscriptions must be understood of Vows made in the very beginning of those Princes's Reign, and which were to be paid ten years after.* This may be a very proper Commentary on the Medals of *Julian* magisterially referred to by the Journalist, without any particular quotation, if they are like the

two

† Noris. Op. T. II. p. 1209. Diff. de Votis Decen.

P R E F A C E.

two Medals of that Prince related by *Du Choul*, † one of which has,

VOT
X
MVL T
XX

and the other

VOT
*
XX

The second Mistake I am going to take notice of, flipt from a Man whom I am very far from confounding with those who have not made that Provision of Literary knowledge, which is necessary to give a tolerable account of the Books daily published on all the branches of Learning. One of the Authors of *La Bibliothèque Raisonnée* (whose very mistakes, even in point of quotations, have been faithfully copied, without the least mention of him, by another Author) has offered † some considerations in order to shew that *Julian* may be reasonably suspected, of having set at work those, who, by his own account, forced him to accept the Empire ; and his conjectures, tho' no ways conclusive, in my
humble

† Du Choul. Rel. des A. Rom. p. 275.

† Bibl. Raison. T. XV. p. 172. & suiv.

P R E F A C E. xi

humble opinion, deserve to be more carefully examined, than it is possible for me to do in this Preface. Therefore I shall content myself with observing an oversight he committed in a place where he should have been the most careful to avoid it. He censures *F. La Bletterie* for having, as he thinks, *softened a circumstance* related by *Julian* himself, viz. that he had got Information of the design of the Army, before he retired into his apartment on the evening which preceded the Revolution, and relates the *Greek* words of *Julian* to support his Censure : But what is surprizing is, that *F. La Bletterie's* Translation of *Julian's* words, *I received some Advices*, is more exact than that of his Censurer, *I was informed of the whole Affair*, which expresses rather the *Latin* Version than the original word, *ἡμετέραν*. It would be hard to prove that the word *ἡμετέραν* necessarily implies more than a general Intelligence, or an Indication : Yet it is on *Julian's* being acquainted with *the whole Affair* that all
the

xii P R E F A C E.

the stress of the Journalist's Argument lies.

Thus much concerning the Subjects I have either treated or left out. As for the manner in which I have handled them, I shall say nothing; only that the Reader may depend on the exactness of the Quotations. As I am fully convinced that second-hand Authorities are the source of many blunders, I have made it my particular care to alledge none without taking it from the Original, or when I have receded from that method, which I have done but very seldom, I have quoted the Author from whom I took the passage alledged; and as I look upon attributing to an Author whose Name and Reputation gives weight to what he says, any thing that is not really in his Books, as inconsistent with honesty, I have been especially cautious not to mistake the meaning of the Men of Note I have quoted, or to set it in a wrong light.

D I S-





DISSERTATIONS

CONCERNING

JULIAN.

DISSERTATION I.

*Upon the outward State of Christianity,
when Julian came to the Imperial
Throne.*

JULIAN's receding from Christiani-
ty, which he had professed for seve-
ral Years, is so remarkable an Event,
that it well deserves our inquiring into the
Circumstances that attended it, and chief-
ly into the Motives that may have induced

B

that

that Prince to Apostatize. To this Effect it may be proper to examine the State and Strength of that Party which he abandoned; for thereby, we shall be enabled to judge, whether his Apostacy can be imputed to any political View, or some other Motive is to be sought for.

Christianity had been spreading, and gaining Ground continually, for three hundred Years, when *Julian* came into the World. From the very beginning the Gospel had been preached to all the Nations then known (a), and the first 25 Years after our Saviour's Ascension employed in laying the Foundations of the Church in every Province and even in every City. I shall not trouble the Reader with a tedious Enumeration of the several Nations converted during the former Ages of Christianity, and of the Names of the Preachers by whose Ministry they were brought to the knowledge of God in Jesus Christ. A long and methodical List of them may be had from the (b) Centuriators of *Magd-burg*. It is also unnecessary to our present purpose, to take any particular notice of Nations that were utterly strangers to the Roman

(a) Lactant. de Mortib. pers. cap. 2. per omnes Provincias & Civitates.

(b) Cent. i. lib. ii. c. 2. C. ii. c. 2. C. iii. c. 2. C. iv. cap. 2.



Roman Empire, and therefore I shall content my self with a general Observation. Notwithstanding the Efforts of all the earthly Powers, and the Torrents of Blood spilled every where, after the first twenty five years before mentioned, to prevent the Growth of the new Sect; the Building begun by the Apostles went on so successfully, that before the End of the second Century (c), the Religion of Christ had diffused itself thro' all the known Parts of the World, and was every where followed by numberless Multitudes. But as successful as the Gospel Predication had been in the rest of the World, it was (d) more fully and triumphantly so in the vast Roman Empire. Under Commodus, about the Year 180, the Christians, supported undoubtedly by the Empress Marcia (e), who was their Protectress, met with more Favour than before (f). Men of all Ranks, Numbers of noble and wealthy Persons, and whole Families flock-

B 2

ed

(c) See *Tertul.* ad Scapul. cap. 3. & advers. jud. cap. 7.

(d) *Echard's Eccles. Hist.* p. 369. on the Year 201.

(e) *Xiphil.* Epit. *Dion.* in Commod.

(f) *Euseb.* E. H. V. 21. Μεταξείλητο μὲν ἐπὶ τῷ πρῶτον τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς . . . ὁ σωτήριος λόγος ἐκ παντὸς γένους ἀνθρώπων πᾶσαν ὑπήγετο ψυχὴν . . . Ἐπὶ Ῥώμης εὖ μάλα πλοῦτον καὶ γένει διαφανῶν, πλείους ἐπὶ τὴν εὐδαίμονα ὁμῶς χωρεῖν πανοικί τε καὶ πανγενῇ σωτηρίαν.

ed into the Church; and a few Years after (g), " Christians were in the Cities, " Towns, Villages, in the Camp, in the " Senate, in the Palace, and in all Places, " besides the Pagan Temples and Thea- " tres, and that in such Numbers and " Multitudes, that *Tertullian* assures us, " that if they had unanimously retired to " any other Country, the Empire should " have become a meer Desert and Soli- " tude." The Pagan *Cæcilius* (introduced by *Minutius Felix*, in his Dialogue, wrote about the Year two hundred and twenty), represents Christianity as still increasing (b). " As the worst Things are the most fruit- " ful, *says he*, the abominable Rites of that " impious Society go on diffusing them- " selves throughout the whole World, " thro' a daily Progress of Perverseness " in the Morals of Mankind", to which *Octavius* replies (i), *It is to our Honour, that our Numbers increase every Day. O- rigenes* speaks to the same Purpose, a-
bout

(g) Echard. ubi sup. The Apol. of *Tertullian*, which Echard transcribes was written according to some in the Year 196, for the latest in 217.

(b) Ut fecundius nequiora proveniunt, serpentibus in dies perditis moribus, per universum orbem Sacra-
ria ista teterrima impiæ coitionis adolescunt. *Min. Fel. Octav.* p. 360.

(i) Et quod in dies nostri numerus augetur, non est crimen erroris, sed testimonium laudis. *ibid.* p. 392.

bout the Year 247 (k), the Word of God, says he, accompanied with Miracles, has subdued all Mankind, and there is no Nation that could avoid receiving the Doctrine of Jesus; a few Years after (251) Cyprian represents the Church as a Tree (l), so full of Sap, that it extends its Branches over the whole Earth, and a River that becomes larger every Day, by the Affluence of new Streams running into it. In a Word, Christianity received a considerable accession of Strength during that whole Century, which was the less surprising, as (according to (m) Dodwell's Observation, and the Testimony of Spartian and Lampridius), several Emperors were then Friends to the Christians, and most of them, at least, using them kindly, it was natural that the reasonableness and solidity of our Religion should get the better of Pagan Fables and Superstitions. It cannot be denied that the Church met with several Storms; but they were

B 3

all

(k) Πᾶσαν γὰρ φύσιν ἀνθρώπων ὁ μετὰ δυνάμεως λαληθεὶς λόγος κεκράτηκε· καὶ οὐκ ἔστι τι γένος ἰδεῖν ἀνθρώπων ὃ ἐκπέφυγε παρὰδεξασθαι τὴν Ἰησοῦ διδασκαλίαν. *Orig. adv. Cels.* ii. 13.

(l) Ramos suos in universam terram copia ubertatis extendit: Profluentes largiter vivos latius expandit. *Cypr. Opera*, p. 195. *de unit. Eccles.*

(m) See Dodwell's *Dissert. de paucitate Martyrum* §. 10, 11, 12, 47. *Spartian.* in Carac. & Heliog. *Lampr.* in Alex. Severo.

all of a short duration, and none of them such as could prevent the Religion of Christ from getting daily new Profelytes.

This can be easily made out from the situation Christianity was in when *Diocletian* came to the Throne, in the Year 284, and even (n) *during far the greatest Part of that Prince's Reign*. Christians were then, not only tolerated, but favoured; and their *Congregations daily increased to an extraordinary Degree*. Thus, at our first entering into the fourth Century, we find Christianity upon a much better Footing in the World, than it is generally imagined it ever was before *Constantine* established it by human Laws (o). “Christians . . . had now
 “ increased to an extraordinary Degree,
 “ filled the Imperial Palaces, and obtained
 “ the best Offices in State; so that, as *Eusebius* observes, it is impossible to describe
 “ the vast Assemblies, the numerous Congregations, and the Multitudes that
 “ thronged in every City to embrace the
 “ Faith of Christ; for which Reason, they
 “ were no longer satisfied with the old
 “ Edifices, but erected spacious Churches
 “ . . . throughout all the Cities of the Empire.” The Gospel, says *Eusebius*, was
 not

(n) *Echard* on the Year 284. p. 442.

(o) *Echard* on the Year 301. p. 448.

not only (p) freely preached, but gloriously received every where. The very Emperors gave particular Marks of their Kindness to the Christians, appointed them Governors over Nations, distinguished them in Proportion as they were most attached to the Religion of Christ, suffered their Empreses, their Children, their Palace Officers, not only to profess, but to glory in the Profession of that Faith, and shewed them such Favour, that, probably to follow their Example, the Bishops, or Chiefs, of the Churches, met every where with uncommon Marks of honourable Distinction, from every body, and especially from the Governors. Under such Circumstances one may easily judge what Progress Christianity made in the Roman Empire, and was there no other Proof of it, we might conclude how numerous Christians were, at that time, from the numberless Disputes and Conflicts that then happened

B 4

between

(p) Euseb. Eccl. Hist. proem. & lib. viii. cap. 1.

δόξης ὁμοῦ καὶ παρρησίας . . . ἤκωτο . . . Ἰουλιανὸν δ' ἂν γένοιτο τῶν κρατούντων, [he means not only the two Emperors *Dioctetian* and *Maximianus Herculus*, but the two Cæsars *Constantius Chlorus* & *Galerius Maximianus Armentarius*.] αἱ περὶ τοὺς ἡμετέρας δεξιώσεις, οἷς καὶ τὰς τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐνεχείριζον ἡγεμονίας, ἡς περὶ τὸ Θεῖον ἀγωνίας κατὰ πολλὴν ἦν ἀπέσπῳρον περὶ τὸ δόγμα Φιλίαν αὐτοὺς ἀπαλλάττοντες . . . γαμεταῖς τε καὶ καίσι καὶ δικέταις . . . ἐγκαυχᾶσθαι ἐπὶ τῇ παρρησίᾳ τῆς πίστεως ἐπιτρέποντες . . . τοὺς ἡμῶν ἐκκλησίαν ἀρχοντας παρὰ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις καὶ ἡγεμοσίν ἀποδοχῆς καὶ βεραπίας καὶ δεξιώσεως οὐ τῆς τοχοῦσης ἣν ὁρᾶν ἀξιομύμους.

between their Bishops: But the number of Christian Churches at *Rome* supplies us with a less displeasing Argument. *Optatus*, an *African* Bishop, who, according to *Basnage's* (q) Remark, speaks of the time we are now upon, reckons they were (r) *above forty*. And if that Number in one City, how many thro' the whole World!

This flourishing State of our Religion was interrupted by a barbarous and ten Years Persecution, at the Beginning of which, in the Year 303, (s) *almost all mankind had abandoned the Worship of the Gods, and gone over to the Christians*, if we may depend on the Evidence of a cruel and crafty Persecutor, *Maximinus*, (who expresses himself thus in his Edict of the Year 312), and of *Dioctletian* himself, who could hardly be persuaded by *Galerius*, to enter upon such violent Measures, because, said he, (t) *it was a pernicious thing thus to disturb the whole World*. However that furious Storm did not put a Stop to the Progress of the Gospel,

(q) *Basnage* Hist. de l'Egl. i. 6. p. 25.

(r) *Opt. Miles.* Cont. *Parmen.* ii. p. 39. inter quadraginta et quod excurrit Basilicas, locum ubi colligerent non habebant [*Donatistæ*].

(s) *Maxim. in Edict. ap Euseb.* Hist. ix. 9. Σχεδὸν πάντας ἀνθρώπους κατέλιπε θεῖσης τῆς τῶν Θεῶν θρησκείας, τῷ ἔθνει τῶν χριστιανῶν ἑαυτοῦς συμμεμικότας.

(t) *Lactant. de Mort. persec.* cap. ii. Ostendens quam perniciosum esset inquietari orbem terræ.

Gospel, which made still new Conquests, and had then the Advantage of convicting several of the most learned among the *Gentiles*. This is warranted by *Arnobius*, a learned Convert, who wrote in the very Beginning of that Persecution, and *Lactantius*, a most elegant Professor of Rhetorick at that time, who undertook to confute Paganism during its greatest Fury. The first makes it an Argument in Favour of the Gospel, that it had gained so much ground in an inconsiderable time, as to be received every where, and to be chearfully embraced by so many and (u) *such ingenious Orators, Grammarians, Rhetoricians, Lawyers, Physicians, and Philosophers*; the latter argues from a Fact, which he would never have ventured to aver, had not it been notoriously true, viz. that (w) *Pagans daily became Christians, whereas, in the very height of Persecution, no Christian turned Pagan*; and that *the Law of God being re-*

B 5

ceived

(u) *Arnob.* lib. ii. p. 59. Quod tam magnis ingeniis præditi Oratores, Grammatici, Rhetores, Consulti juris ac Medici, Philosophiæ etiam secreta rimantes magisteria hæc expetant spretis quibus paulo ante fidebant.

(w) *Lact. Divin. Inst.* v. 13. Cum autem noster numerus semper de Deorum cultibus augeatur, nunquam vero, ne in ipsâ quidem persecutione minuat — Cum vero ab ortu solis usque ad occasum lex Divina suscepta sit, & omnis sexus, omnis ætas, & gens, & regio unis ac paribus animis Deo serviant; eadem sit ubique patientia, idem contemptus mortis.

ceived from the East to the West, the same Zeal for his Service, the same Patience, and the same Contempt of Death appeared every where. Thus the Christian Interest was but little, if any thing at all, weakened by that Persecution; as the few Breaches made by Apostacy were more than filled up by new Conversions; even those who outwardly apostatized being still Christians in their Heart. The Emperors themselves knew that the Inclinations of the Generality of the People were bent that way, since *Maximian* caused the Persecution to cease in *Italy*, before he abdicated the Empire, (x) to ingratiate himself to his Subjects, according to *Dodwell's* Remark, and *Maxentius* (y) in the beginning of his Reign put on a Mask of Piety, and feigned to be a Christian, in order to please and flatter the Romans. The Armies were no less favourable to Christianity than the unarmed Multitude, and the learned *Dodwell* thinks this was the Reason why the Persecutors of those times were so much hated, and (z) for which in particular

(x) *Dod. de paucit. Mart.* § 77. gratiam subditis faciebat, quo gratior illis acceptiorque esset ejus memoria.

(y) *Eus. Ecc. H. viii.* 14. Ἀρχόμενος μὲν τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς πίσιν ἐκ ἀρεσκείας καὶ κολακείας τοῦ δήμου Ῥωμαίων καθευτεκρίσας . . . εὐσεβείαν ἐπιμορφαίαν.

(z) *Dod. ubi sup.* Cur in Persecutores omnes in Italia populi tanto odio flagrabant, ut tradiderit in Italia exercitus Severum, ipsum esset Galerium traditurus?

particular *Severus* was betrayed by his Troops, and *Galerius* was like to share the same Fate.

It has been necessary to give the above Account of the Times before *Constantine*, to enable the Reader to judge the better of the State of Christianity when once on the Throne; for you can never make a right Judgment of a whole Sum, except you take notice of the several Sums that have from time to time been added to the original Stock, as well as of the Stock itself, and of its Increase at any particular time.

Now we are come to *Constantine's* Reign, who declared himself a Christian; and, from what has been mentioned before, one may venture to affirm, that his interest should have prompted him to act as he did, tho' he had been of no Religion at all. But his Behaviour was an Argument of his Sincerity and Zeal, tho' a (a) modern Unbeliever, who, I must suppose did not know that the *Arian* Heresy took its rise but several Years after, has advanced that *he at first espoused the Arian Interest to mount the Throne*. Under his Protection the Name of Christ was preached every where with Success, and (b) *his Religion grew wonderfully strong*, says, *Sulpitius Severus*,

(a) *Blount's Oracles of Reason*, p. 98.

(b) *Sulpit. Sev. Sac. Hist. lib. ii.* Hoc temporum tractu mirum est quantum invaluerit Religio Christiana.

Severus, for according to *Berengofius*, *Constantine* (c) brought almost the whole World to profess the same Faith with him. *Eusebius*, a cotemporary Writer, gives a full Account of the many Laws that Prince published in favour of Christianity, and of the many Favours he bestowed upon Christians; (d) Now, says he, the Church of Christ enjoyed a clear Day: the Heavenly Light shone over the whole World without the least Cloud that could obscure it, and the very Pagans did not envy our Joy. Then he proceeds to shew how powerfully the Religion of Christ was then supported. It would be an endless Work to follow him into the Particulars. Therefore I shall content myself with some few Remarks upon that long Reign, which was a continual Series of Prosperity for Christians, in Opposition to the Pagans, tho' the latter Part of it seems to have been obscured by that Emperor's Partiality to the *Arian* Faction.

i. *Constantine* made a great number of Laws in favour of Christians, (most of which

(c) *Bereng.* in *Bibl. Pat.* T. xii. p. 356. Totum enim orbem ad eandem pœne perduxerat fidem.

(d) *Euseb.* H. Ec. x. i. ημέρα δὲ λοιπὸν ἤδη Φαιδρὰ καὶ διαυγὴς, μηδεὶς νέφους αὐτὴν ἐπισκιάζοντος, φωτὸς οὐρανοῦ βλααῖς ἀνατὴν διοικουμένην ἅπασαν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τοῦ Χριστοῦ κατήγγαζεν. οὐδὲ τις ἦν καὶ τοῖς ἔξωθεν τοῦ κατὰ ἡμᾶς διασίου φθόνος.

which may be seen in the *Code of Theod. Lib. xvi.* and in that of *Justinian, Lib. i.* granting them immunities and privileges of all Sorts.

2. He (e) encouraged many to become Christians, by giving Gratuities to such as followed his Example.

3. He (f) granted new Privileges to such Towns and Corporations as abandoned Paganism, whereby several were brought over to Christianity.

4. On the other Hand he put the Gentiles under such Restraints, and Discouragements, that none could adhere to the old Religion of the Empire, but those who had a great Zeal for their Ancestors Superstitions; and (considering how little motives to Perseverance the Pagan Religion afforded, and the wonderful Progress Christianity had made under the former Reigns) the number of those must have been very small. None were compelled to turn Christians, but they were in a great Measure hindered from being Heathen; for I don't see how a Religion, that consisted chiefly, if not entirely in outward Worship and Ceremonies could well subsist, when Laws were enacted and put in Execution,

(g) where-

(e) See *Enseb, Vita Const. iii. 58.*

(f) See about Constantinop. *Vit. Const. iii. 48.* about *Majuma*; *ibid. iv. 38.* about divers other Towns, *ibid. 39* τὰν τὸν δὲ καὶ ἑτέρας πλείους διαπρατίνοντο χάρα.

(g) whereby Sacrifices and all other Acts of Idolatry were forbidden, several Temples were pulled down, and none suffered to be opened, (b) tho' they were left standing for the Ornament of Towns. In general the People and the very Priests had so little zeal for the Objects of their Worship, that, as soon as they saw them become an Object of Scorn and Derision (as they did of course thro' the Multitude's Conversion to Christianity, and *Constantine's* Directions to pull down several of the most renowned Idols) many of them embraced the Religion then on the Throne, whether they thought it better, or only as good as that which they had formerly followed.

“(i) A great Number of Pagans were daily converted, says Mr. *Fleury* in the Year 326, some because they saw how groundless, and useless, their former Superstitions were; some out of Jealousy

(g) See *V. Const.* ii. 45. Mr. *Valois* is of Opinion that this Law prohibited none but Domestic Sacrifices, and his Sentiment may be confirmed from the chap. 56 and 60. But even this was a great Restraint, and it is certain that other Laws were made by *Constantine* to prohibit all kinds of Sacrifices whatsoever. See *Cod. Theod.* lib. xvi. Tit. 10. l. 2. *Godfrey's* Comment. on l. 3. and several authorities quoted by the same in his Notes upon *Libanii orat. de Templis.* p. 44.

(b) *Vit. Const.* iii. 54, 57.

(i) *Fleury Hist. Eccles.* 4°. T. iii. p. 188.

“ lousy to the Christians, whom they
 “ saw honoured and beloved by the Em-
 “ peror, and to conform to the Sovereign's
 “ Inclination; some after examining the
 “ Christian Doctrine, judged it was more
 “ adviseable to turn to that Side.—Whole
 “ Towns and Nations were converted;
 “ they pulled down their own Temples
 “ and Idols, and built Churches in their
 “ stead.”

5. I forbear mentioning, for the present, what relates to employments both Civil and Military, and to the Army in general, because I intend to consider that Matter with more exactness when we are come to *Julian's* own Time.

6. It is not our present business to examine whether the Means pursued by *Constantine* to increase Christianity were the most agreeable to the Genius of the Gospel; but, in fact, they brought such multitudes into the Church, that new Edifices were required every where, to hold those who resorted to Christian Assemblies (k). These were provided in many Places at the Emperor's own Cost, and ordered to be built in others at the Expence of the Communities.

7. It is worth observing that, as early as the Year 321, Paganism was fallen into
 such

(k) *Vit. Const.* i. 42. ii. 46. & passim, *H. Ec.* x.
 4. *Orat. de Laud. Const.* 7.

such discredit, that *Constantine* was obliged to grant (l) a Kind of Protection to the Physicians, Grammarians and other Professors of Learning (who were generally the most obstinate in the antient Superstitions) lest the hatred born to their Religion should expose them to insults from the Populace, injustice from the Magistrates, and denial of their lawful Salaries from the Towns and Corporations that had formerly appointed them Professors. The learned *James Godefroy* observes upon this Law, that, as the Christian Religion was then the strongest, those, mostly gentile, Professors, were despised, and the Towns, as they had embraced Christianity, were loth to pay Salaries to Pagan Doctors. *Licinius* must have been very sensible of that general Inclination of the People to Christianity, when, to prevent the entire fall of Paganism, he (m) forbade the Bishops to converse with the Pagans, lest they should by that Means increase the Christian Interest.

Thus we have continued our Account of the State of Christianity to the Time of *Julian*, who was born on the 6th Day of November, in the Year 331. *Constantine* died

(l) See *Cod. Theod.* lib. xiii. Tit. 3. Leg. i. & *Jacobi Gothofredi* Comment. upon that Law.

(m) *Socrat. H. Ec.* 1. 3. νόμος γὰρ ἐκέλευε τοὺς ἐπισκόπους μὴ φουτᾶν παρ' Ἑλλήνων, ὥς ἂν μὴ ἔχοι πρίφασιν ἀνίστασθαι τὰ χριστιανῶν.

died a few Years after, leaving Christianity the only Religion by Law established in the Empire, and Paganism scarcely upon the Footing of Toleration. He was succeeded by his three Sons, who were as great, or even greater Enemies to Idolatry than he had ever been. We still have several of their Laws both in Favour of Christianity and against Paganism. It seems that *Constantine's* Laws, for the Suppression of Idolatry, had not been strictly observed; and this may have induced *Libanius* to say of that Emperor, that (n) *he had not suppressed the Worship by Law established, and that under him, every thing was performed in the Temples as before: But, under his Sons, new Laws were made to enforce the former ones, and to have them put to Execution. In the Year 341 Constantine ordered (o) that Superstition (by which Word the Commentator observes he understood all Sorts of idolatrous Service) should cease, Sacrifices be entirely*

(n) *Lib. pro temp. ad Theod. p. 9.* Τῆς κατὰ νόμους δὲ θεραπειᾶς ἐκίνησεν οὐδὲν . . . παρὲν δὲ ὁρᾶν ἅπαντα τ' ἄλλα πληρούμενα.

(o) *Cod. Theod. lib. xvii. Tit. 10. l. 2.* Cesset superstitio: sacrificiorum aboleatur insania: nam quicumque contra legem Divi Principis parentis nostri & hanc nostræ mansuetudinis jussionem ausus fuerit sacrificia celebrare, competens in eum vindicta, & præsens sententia exeratur, *ibid. l. 3. in the Year 342,* omnis superstitio penitus eruenda.

entirely abolished, and that whoever dared to celebrate a Sacrifice, should be severely punished without Delay. *Constantius* must have published before that Time some Edict to the same Effect, tho' we find none under his Name so early as this; either in the *Justinian* or in the *Theodosian* Collection; and these Laws were severely executed, for we learn from *Libanius* that (p) an Uncle of *Crispinus*, a Friend of his, was put to Death at Heraclea (in *Constantius's* Dominions) for some idolatrous Practices that were contrary to Law. By *Libanius's* Age and other Circumstances, this must have happened before the Year 338, and it is not probable that *Constantius's* Zeal against the Temples, the Altars, the Idols, the Sacrifices, &c. which is so frequently mentioned in the Authors of that Age, had no earlier Effects than the Edict of the Year 353, of which we shall speak hereafter. However, it is certain that Paganism decayed daily whilst these Princes sat on the Throne, and Christianity increased proportionably. We have a very remarkable Account of the respective State of both Religions

(p) *Lib. de vita sua, Ed. Morel. T. ii. p. 11.* Καὶ τοι νόμος γε ἔργε, καὶ ἔν ἡ δίκη τῷ τολμῶντι θάνατος. *Libanius* expresses himself in such a manner, that one might suspect some magical Practices attended the idolatrous Rites of *Crispinus's* Uncle.

ligions in *Julius Firmicus Maternus's* Book, wherein he lays before the two then surviving Emperors, *Constans* and *Constantius*, the Vanity of Paganism; and exhorts them to give the last Blow to that expiring Monster. (q) "What Place is there in the
 " World, says he, where the Name of
 " Christ does not reign? His divine and
 " adorable Majesty has filled the East, the
 " West, the North, and the South: And
 " tho' the dying Members of Idolatry still
 " seem to retain some Life in several Coun-
 " tries, yet Things are come to such a
 " Pass, that that Plague is now to be
 " entirely destroyed in Christian Countries.
 " There is but little left for you to
 " do, and the Devil, entirely routed by
 " your Laws, shall perish; the deadly
 " Contagion of Idolatry shall be entirely
 " extinct and abolished. The Force of
 " that Venom is already vanished away,
 " and Profaneness wears off every Day."

One

(q) *Jul. Firm. Mat. de errore prof. rel. cap. 21.*
Bib. Pat. T. iv. p. 172. Quis locus in terra est, quem
 non Christi possiderit nomen? Qua sol oritur, &c.
 Et licet adhuc in quibusdam regionibus idolola-
 triæ morientia palpitent membra, tamen in eo res est
 ut e christianis omnibus terris pestiferum hoc malum
 penitus amputetur. Modicum tantum superest,
 ut legibus vestris funditus prostratus diabolus jaceat:
 ut extinctæ idololatriæ pereat funesta contagio. Ve-
 neni hujus virtus evanuit, & per dies singulos substan-
 tia profanæ cupiditatis expirat.

One might suspect that *Julius Firmicus* had exaggerated Matters did not all the accounts of Pagan Writers, exactly agree with his. But let any one consult *Libanius*, *Themistius*, *Julian* himself, and all those who have taken any particular Notice of the State of Religion at that Time, and he shall find they are so many Evidences to support *Firmicus's* Testimony. *Libanius* talking of the Expectations of the Pagans, when *Julian* came to the Throne, says they were in Hopes his Counsels woud (r) cure the Universe of the Disease of Christianity; which shews how extensive he took that Doctrine to be: As for his own Religion, he represents it as having been effectually put (s) to Flight by *Julian's* Predecessors, and its Sectators as having no Method left to address themselves to Heaven, but (t) silently to sigh, there being no Altars left. The Description he gives of the Condition *Hellenism* was in, at the Time of *Julian's* living in *Asia*, deserves a particular Notice. (u) The Temples were demolished, the Mysteries had

(r) *Epitap. ap. Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. vii. p. 235.* Τῇ τοῦδε γάμῃ θεραπεύσθηναι τὴν γῆν.

(s) *Ibid. p. 286.* Ὡςπερ Φυγάδα τὴν εὐσεβείαν κατήγαγε.

(t) *Ibid. p. 280.* Σιγῇ τε καὶ βωμῶν χωρίς, ὃ γὰρ ἦσαν.

(u) *Ibid. p. 235.* Νεώς τε ὄρων κειμένους, καὶ τελευτὰς πεπαιγμένους, καὶ βωμοὺς ανατετραμμένους, καὶ θυσίας ἀνηρημένους, καὶ ἱερῆς ἱλανομένης, καὶ τῶν τῶν ἱερῶν πλῆτων εἰς τὰς ἀσελγεστάτας μεμερισμένων.

had ceased, the Altars were destroyed, the Sacrifices taken away, the Priests banished, and the sacred Treasures divided among the Christians. And one may judge how long Paganism had been in that lingering Condition, from what that Author says in another Place, that, when the Festivals of the Gods began to be celebrated again under Julian, (w) none but a few old Men could remember how they were to proceed in the Solemnities. This last Particular is confirmed from what Julian writes to his Friend (x) Aristomenes, that he found but a few in Cappadocia who would offer Sacrifices, and even they did not know how. Such an Ignorance argues, if I am not mistaken, a Disuse of a pretty long Standing, which, if we make it only twenty Years, shall bring us back, from the Year 361, to Firmicus's Time. Now lest any body should imagine this concerned some particular Places or Provinces only, I shall produce two or three Passages more out of Julian's Works, and one out of Themistius, to shew how that Religion was extended, to whose Growth the Decay of Paganism was owing.

Julian

(w) Lib. de vita sua. Ed. Morel. T. ii. p. 41.

ὅτι ὀλίγοι τινὲς ἐπισημοὶς λελειμένοι γέροντες.

(x) Ep. iv. Arist. Phil. Ὀλίγας δὲ τινὰς ἰδόντας μὲν, οὐκ ἰδοντας δὲ θύειν ὁρῶ.

Julian says, that (y) almost all, a few only excepted, had been perverted thro' the Folly of the Galileans. In his Discourse to *Heraclius* the Cynic, he represents himself as purposely appointed by *Jupiter* (z) to prevent the Gospel's becoming the Rule of all Mankind, which carries an Insinuation, that it then was not very far from being so. In another Place he acknowledges the same Thing, tho' he seems to ascribe the Deser-tion of the Temples, and the general Pro-fession of Christianity, to meer Terror and Hypocrisy. (a) *Hitherto*, says he, People might have many Reasons not to appear in the Temples, and the Fear that impended every where was a good Excuse for one to conceal the true Opinion he held concerning the Gods. That some, who professed Christianity, were only Time-servers, can scarcely be denied; but what followed shewed, that the far greater Number were sincere. Notwith-standing *Julian's* repeated Efforts to in-crease the Number of Pagans, and his (b) boasting

(y) *Ep. vii. Artab.* Διὰ γὰρ τὴν Γαλιλαίων μωρίαν, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἄπαντα ἀνθρώπων.

(z) *Orat. vii. p. 229.* Ὅπως ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὁ πονηρὸς ὑποσὶ τῆς ἀνοσιουργίας ζῆλος μὴ παντάπασι ἐπικρατήσῃ.

(a) *Ep. xlii.* Ἔως μὲν ἐν τέττε πολλὰ ἦν τὰ αἰτία τῷ μὴ φοιτᾶν εἰς τὰ ἱερά, καὶ ὁ πανταχόθεν ἐπικεκράμενος φόβος ἐδίδοι συγνώμην ἀποκρύπτεισθαι τὰς ἀληθεστάτας ὑπὲρ τῶν Θεῶν δόξας.

(b) *Epist. xliv. Arfac.* Κρείττονα πάσης μὲν εὐχῆς, πάσης

boasting that he had put that Scheme into Execution, with *more Success than could have been hoped for*; the Temples (c) were again abandoned immediately after the Apostate's Death, tho' Jovian left every body at liberty to chuse what Religion they pleased; *some were pulled down, those that had not been finished were left imperfect, and became a Subject of Raillery to the Christians, whose Teachers began again to be had in Esteem*, as Libanius tells us. Now, how inconsiderable the Number of professed Pagans was before Julian's Accession to the Throne must appear from the Calculation made by Themistius under the reign of Jovian. That Orator, (probably the same who, in the Beginning of Julian's Reign, had wrote to him that he was designed by Providence for a Work of the same Kind with what had been performed by Bacchus and Hercules, who (d) who had purged the Earth and the Sea from Evils that had almost covered both) reckons that the Worshippers of the Gods, a few

πάσης δὲ ἐλπίδος . . . τίς γὰρ ἐν ὀλίγῳ ταυσαύτην καὶ τη-
λικαύτην μεταβολὴν ὀλίγῳ πρότερον ἐτόλμα;

(c) Liban. Epit. ap. Fab. B. G. T. vii. p. 369. Οἷα
γὰρ αὐθις ἐπιστῆλθε τῇ τῷ βασιλείῳ σφαγῇ; σιμῶν μὲν
οἱ κατὰ τῶν Θεῶν δημηγοροῦντες . . . νῦν δὲ οἱ μὲν
κατεσκάφησαν, οἱ δὲ ημιτέλειοι γέλωτος ἐστῶσι, χριστιανοὶ τοῖς
μαροῖς.

(d) Πᾶσαν σχεδὸν τῆς ἐπιπολαζέσης κακίας ἀνακα-
θαιρόμενοι γῆν τε καὶ θάλασσαν. Jul. Epist. ad Themist.
p. 253. edit. Spanheim.

a few Months after *Julian's* Death, were five to one, (e) or fifty to ten of what they had been in *Constantine's* time. But as it is certain, by the bitter Complaints of (f) *Libanius*, that the Odds were by much in favour of Christianity, when that Discourse of *Themistius* was spoken, we must conclude that the Christians, were at least, nine to one Pagan before *Julian* came to the Throne. And it is not to be imagined that any considerable Number professed Christianity out of Fear, tho' they were Heathen in their Hearts; for no body was deterred by the Laws, from declaring his Sentiments. The severest Edicts never went so far as to force any one to profess Christianity. The Pagans were left at Liberty to think and say what they pleased, provided they performed no Rites of their Religion. The Edict published when *Julian* was about twenty two Years of Age, in the Year 553, rigorous as it was, went no further. (g) "It

(e) That is the Sense of this Passage, wherein *Themistius* praises *Jovian* for having granted a Liberty whereby the true Sentiments of those who had disguised their Religion when penal Laws were in force, might at last appear. Μικρὸν δὲν χρόνος ἐν τοῖς δέκα, σήμερον δὲ ἐν τοῖς πεντήκοντα; οἱ αὐτοὶ πρὸς βαμνοῖς, πρὸς ἱερῶν [leg. ἱερῶν] πρὸς ἀγάλμασι, πρὸς τεταρτίῳ. *Themist. Orat. v. ad Jovian. p. 67.*

(f) In Epitaph. bib. Fab. T. vii p. 319.

(g) " It is our Will, says *Constantius*, that
 " the Temples be immediately shut up,
 " and that no body be permitted to enter
 " therein. We do also command every
 " body to abstain from Sacrifices. If any
 " one shall attempt any thing of that kind,
 " let him be put to death, and his For-
 " tune forfeited. Let the Governors of the
 " Provinces be punished in the same man-
 " ner, if they neglect to bring the Offen-
 " ders to punishment. But tho' Christianity
 was imposed on no body, yet, by this and
 other such Laws, Paganism was reduced to
 such a low Ebb, that it could not make a
 very considerable Figure in the World; and
 thus it is not without reason that Mr. *Fleury*
 says of *Julian*, (b) *he durst not attack the*
Christians openly, because he knew what a
wonderful Multitude they were; and Gregory
Nazianzen, (i) *the Christians were so power-*
 ful,

(g) *Cod. Theod. lib. xvi. tit. 10. l. 4. & Cod. Just. lib. 1. tit. 11. l. 1.* Placuit omnibus locis at-
 que urbibus universis claudi protinus Tempia, et ac-
 cessu vetitis omnibus licentiam delinquendi perditis ab-
 negari. Volumus etiam cunctos sacrificiis abstinere.
 Quod si quis aliquid forte hujusmodi perpetraverit
 gladio ultore sternatur. Facultates etiam perempti
 fisco decernimus vindicari, et similiter affligi rectores
 Provinciarum si facinora vindicare neglexerint.

(b) *Fleury hist. eccl. t. iv. p. 7.*

(i) Νῦν δὲ ἤδη τῇ σωτηρίᾳ λόγῳ χερίσιν, καὶ περὶ ἡμῶν
 μάλιστα δυνατούσαντος, τὸ περιῆσθαι τὰ χριστιανῶν μετατιθί-
 ναι καὶ παρακινεῖν, ὅδ' ἔτιον ἢ, ἢ τὴν Ρωμαίων παρασα-
 λεύειν ἀρχὴν.

ful, that the very Attempt to bring them to Trouble, was no less than a total Overtbrow of the Roman Empire. This shall appear still more distinctly by a few Observations upon several Points that deserve to be particularly taken notice of.

And first it is not to be denied, but there were still some remains of Paganism. This appears from the very Laws made to suppress it, as well as from other Monuments. But what Remains were they? *F. La Bletterie* observes (*k*) that the chief Supports of Paganism were the Professors of Learning. *M. Wil. Reading* (*l*) has the same Observation, and it is warranted by all antient Accounts. *Libanius* reckons (*m*) none but Men of Letters, or Heathen Priests, among those who flocked about *Julian*, as soon as they heard of his inclination to Idolatry. *Greece* which that Orator represents (*n*) as having groaned under the Laws whereby the Worship of the Gods was prohibited, bred more Scholars than Soldiers; and *Athens*, in particular,

(*k*) *Vie de Julien*. p. 19.

(*l*) *Gentilium tamen numerus erat haud contemnendus maxime eorum qui artium liberalium & scientiarum Gymnasia occupabant. Guil Reading in Socr. H. E. III. 1.*

(*m*) *Lib. Epitap. Jul. Edit. morel. t. ii. p. 265.*
Παῖτες οἱ περὶ τὰς μύσας καὶ τὰς ἄλλας γὰρ θείας.

(*n*) *Lib. Epitap. ap. Fab. B. G. t. vii. p. 280.*

lar, (where it seems by some (o) Circumstances of *Julian's* Account of himself, as well as by (p) *Libanius's* Testimony, that the Exercise of heathenish Superstitions was connived at longer than in any other Place) was, at that Time, an Academy rather than any thing else. But tho' all the learned Men shoud have conspired together, which was very far from being the Case, since a considerable number of those who deserved that name were Followers of the Gospel, yet they could not have made such a considerable Body, as to match the Christians, who had manifestly the advantage of numbers among all other sorts of Men.

(q) *The very Priests*, (according to the Observation of an Author, who, tho' a little later than *Julian's* Age, is much to be depended on, because he appears to have taken most of what he says from cotemporary Writers, whose Words he generally transcribes) *had Christian Wives, Children, and Servants*, and *Julian* when he went a-

C 2

bout

(o) See his *Epist. ad S. P. 2. Athen.* p. 275. He went into the Temple of *Minerva*, and offered his Supplications to that Goddess, a little while before he was declared *Cæsar*.

(p) *Lib. Epitaph. ubi sup.* p. 281. Καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι μὲν ἱθὺς τε χρίοντο.

(q) *Paul. Diac. Bib. Pat. xiii.* p. 255. ipse autem æstuabat ne fervor ejus Christianorum abundantia frustretur . . . Multi Sacerdotum christianas habebant uxores et filios et servos.

bout to set up Paganism in the Empire, was afraid lest his great Design should be baffled by the multitude of Christians.

2. To begin with those who held the greatest Posts under the Emperors, it can scarcely be doubted but they were mostly Christians. Even before Christianity was on the Throne, several Christians had been entrusted with Governments. *Constantine* took (r) a particular care to fill all sorts of Employments of any consequence with Christians, or if any were Pagans, they were forbidden to sacrifice. Thus the very accepting of those Employments was an actual renunciation of the exercise of Paganism; which we cannot suppose to have been done by many who had any Zeal for their Religion. We find no alteration in this Regulation under *Constantine's* Sons, and their known Zeal for the Propagation of Christianity leaves no room to doubt of their observing it rather with more exactness than their Father. This may be confirmed from an Edict of *Constantius* before mentioned, whereby the very negligence in prosecuting the practical Idolaters was made Death

for

(r) *Euseb. Vit. Const. ii. 44. alias 41.* Ἡγεμόνας κατίσταναι τῇ σωτηρίῳ πίσει καθωσιωμένους τὰς πλείους. Ὅσοι δὲ ἑλληνίζον ἰδοῦναι, τέτοις θύειν ἀπέριητο. Ὅδ' αὐτὸς ἦν νόμος καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ὑπερχεμένων τὰς ἡγεμονικὰς ἀρχὰς ἀξιώματι, ἐπὶ τε τῶν αὐτοκράτω καὶ τῶν ἑπαρχῶν διελληφότων ἀκούσαι τὸ μὴ ἰδωλολατρεῖν παρηγοῖναι. See *Deuot. i. 8.*

for the Magistrates and Governors. It is not to be presumed, that a Prince, who made such a Law, had many Pagans in his Service.

3. It has been already taken notice of that Christians were, at least, nine to one in the Empire. Now to come to particulars; we must observe that whole Provinces were so entirely Christian, that one could scarce find a few Pagans in them, even when *Julian* gave the greatest Encouragement to Idolatry, as that (s) Emperor himself says was the case in *Cappadocia*. As for the Towns, there was none but had such a Multitude of Christian Inhabitants, that (t) *it would have been difficult for the Magistrates to reckon their Numbers*. Several had embraced Christianity by solemn Decrees of their Common Councils; some had even (u) pulled down all the Temples of the Idols, tho' there was no Law that required it from them. (w) *Majuma* and (x) *Constantinople*, were of the number of those Christian Towns, and it is remarkable, of this last place, that when *Julian* established Sacrifices there, the Inha-

C 3

bitants

(s) *Jul. Ep. iv. Aristom.* Τὰς μὲν ἐβουλομένους, ὀλίγους δὲ τινὰς ἐθέλοντας μὲν, ἐκ ἰδόντας δὲ θύειν ὄρω.

(t) *Sozom. Hist. Eccl. V. 5.* Σκολῇ γὰρ αἱ τοσούτων καθ' ἑκάστην πόλιν. Οἱ ἀρχόντες τὸν ἀριθμὸν μόνοι ἐπιγράψαντο.

(u) *Liban. Epitaph. bib. Fab. T. vii. p. 288.*

(w) See *Vit. Const. iv. 38.*

(x) *Ibid. iii. 48.*

bitants (y) could not bear it. *Libanius* from whom we have that account of the City of *Constantinople's* opposition to Paganism, reckons (z) *Christianity*, or *Impiety*, as he terms it, among the Faults that had excited *Julian's* wrath against *Antioch*; and by the account *Julian* himself gives of that Town in the *Misopogon*, it must have been entirely Christian. That Prince hated the Inhabitants of *Cæsarea* upon the same account, (a) *because they were all Christians*. He never would enter the Town of (b) *Nisibe* nor that of *Edessa*, for the very same reason. At *Berrhæa* he found (c) but very few of the Town Council, that would even seemingly relish his Discourse upon the Worship of the Gods, (*θεοσεβείας*) as he complains of it in a Letter to *Libanius*; and he had the same reason to be displeased with the (d) *Bostrenians*, and the (e) *Pessmuntians*. Tho' we cannot say the same of *Alexandria*, yet there is reason to think the Christians were more numerous there than the Pagans. Had it been otherwise, the Corporation

(y) *Liban. paneg. in Jul. Edit. Morel. T. ii. p. 243.*
 Τὴν αὐτὴν πατρίδα συνίδιζε μὴ πολιμεῖν τοῖς παλοῖς, ἅμιγα
 ἀνιχομένην καὶ πῶς λυσινιδέντος.

(z) *Lib. Legat. ad Jul. pro Antioch. p. 164. Ἀσεβείαν.*

(a) *Sozom. v. 4.*

(b) See *Tillemont Hist. Eccl. vii. p. 342.*

(c) Ὀλίγοι πάντων *Jul. Ep. xxvii. Liban.*

(d) *Epist. lii. Bostrenis.*

(e) *Ep. xlix. Arsacio. Pontif.*

poration woud never have written a Letter to *Julian*, in favour of *Athanasius*, the greatest Enemy the Idolaters then had; *Julian* woud not have employed (f) the greatest Part of his Answer to persuade those he writes to, to turn Gentiles; and *Marcellinus* woud never have said that (g) *George* (who with two others was slain by the Pagan Populace) *might have been defended and rescued by the Christians; had not the hatred they bore him prevented their attempting any thing in his favour.* The Inclinations of so many considerable Towns in different Provinces of the eastern Empire, may suffice to shew what Religion the generality of People was of in those Parts. Now let us turn to the West.

4. *Rome* deserves a particular Notice, as it still was, in some manner, the Head of the Empire, at least in the West. What the Religion of the generality of the People there was, can scarcely be a Question. Since the Christians had above forty Churches, before the prodigious increase of Christianity under *Constantine* and his sons; one may easily judge what Superiority they had gotten by *Julian's* Time. This may be

C 4

confirmed

(f) *Ep. li. Alexandrinis.*

(g) *Am. Marcel. xxvii, 11. Poterant que miserandi homines ad crudele supplicium ducti, Christianorum adjumento deffendi, ni Georgii odio omnes indiscrete flagrabant.*

confirmed from an Observation of the learned Godfreoy, on a Rescript given by *Constantius* in the Year 353 ; whereby that Prince (b) repeals the Permission granted by *Magnentius* to celebrate Sacrifices at Rome in the night Time. That Tyrant, says Godfreoy, had permitted nightly Sacrifices only ; for perhaps he durst not allow them publicly in day Time. What Reason Father *la Bletterie* can have to say; that, (i) at this Time, some Temples were still open, and the old Rites countenanced by the Majesty of the Roman Senate, I cannot tell, for the contrary is proved by all the Laws relating to this Subject ; some of which were made purposely for Italy, and some for Rome in particular ; as it appears from the Denominations of the Magistrates they are directed to. *Cerealis*, who was to see the last mentioned Law put in Execution (k), was a Member of the Senate, a Magistrate of the first Rank, and a zealous Christian. One should be apt to think that most of the Senators were so too, considering the Influence the Prince's example generally has on Courtiers ; and the Dependance the Roman Senate had been long

(b) *Cod. Theod.* lib. xvi. tit. 10. l. 5. *Abolentur sacrificia nocturna, Magnentio auctore permiffa. And in the Commentary.* Diurna enim forte palam ausus non fuerat.

(i) *Vie de Julien*, p. 19.

(k) See *Gothof. comment.* on that Law.

long since reduced to. Yet the Learned do not agree among themselves on this Point; and the famous *Hardouin* has drawn a severe Censure on himself, from the Learned Mr. *Le Clerc*, for having said that (1) *the Roman Senate was entirely Christian in Julian's Time*. For my part, I find very little more than bare Presumptions to determine that Question; and I own the weakness of such a learned Man as Mr. *Le Clerc*'s answer to *F. Hardouin*, is not the weakest of those arguments that incline me to his Antagonist's Side. It is true the latter has interwoven, with what he says of the Senate's Religion, several Mistakes of a very odd nature: But this can be no prejudice against an Opinion that has nothing to do with that learned Man's Chimæras. He does not quote the Authorities whereon his Sentiment is grounded, which deprives me of the Advantage of a Guide. But Mr. *Le Clerc*'s only Argument against him is such, as can hardly disprove what the Jesuit gives for a notorious Fact (m). If it be true, says he, *that the Roman Senate was Christian under Julian, all that has been said of Symmachus, who lived since, and his Letter to Valentinian,*

C 5

(1) *Jo. Hard. Op. Selecta.* p. 118. *Romanum Senatū tunc totum Christianum.*

(m) *Le Clerc. Bib. choisie. T. xvii. p. 396.*

nian, wrote in Favour of Paganism, in the Senate's name, must be mere Suppositions, as well as St. Ambrose's Answer to that Letter. It is never without some Diffidence, that I venture to attack the Decisions of Great Men; but I must own I am not sensible of the Strength of that Argument. Why might not the Senate have been Christian in the beginning of *Julian's* Reign, and (thro' the Alterations made under that Prince, in all the corporate Bodies, purposely to advance Paganism) having been made mostly Pagan, before *Jovian* came to the Throne, have continued so under two or three Emperors, who were really too weak to attempt any Innovation? Besides *Symmachus's* Narrative to *Valentinian*, chiefly if compared with *Ambrose's* Answer, is far from proving that the Senate was Pagan, at the Time it was written. It is true *Symmachus*, who was a Heathen, and a very superstitious one, must have been authorised by some Decree of the Senate, to offer a Request to the Emperor, in order to have the Altar of Victory, which had been destroyed by *Gratian*, rebuilt in the Place where that Company met; and the Incomes belonging to the several Fraternities of *Vestals* and Pagan Priests restored to them. But the wording of that Request, and the Arguments made use of by *Symmachus*, were his own. But, was the Senate full

full when that Decree passed? This is what we may justly question, as St. *Ambrose* flatly denies (n), that *Rome* desired any such Thing. The occasion of a thin Senate might have been taken by the Favourers of Paganism, to make that Decree; and St. *Ambrose* (o) positively says it was the case. Let not, says he, *such a Request be ascribed to the Senate*. A SMALL NUMBER of Gentiles makes use of a Name that belongs to the whole Body. Suppose the Senate was full; might not a considerable number of Christian Senators have joined with the Pagans, in a Request whereby they did not imagine their Religion was much affected. (For, tho' St. *Ambrose*, in his Answer, supposes that Sacrifices would follow the rebuilding of the Altar (p), there is not a Word to that

(n) Ambros. Opera. T. ii. p. 834. Ep. 18. claf. 1. §. 7. *Non hanc Roma mandavit. aliis illa eos (imperatores) interpellat vocibus . . . non erubescō cum toto orbe longæva converti.*

(o) Ibid. Ep. 17. p. 825. sed absit ut hoc Senatus petisse dicatur! Pauci Gentiles communi utuntur nomine . . . sed fortasse dicatur, cur dudum non interfuerint Senatui [Senatores Christiani] cum ista peterentur.

(p) See *Symm. relat.* inter Ambr. op. ubi sup. p. 828. The Words *Status religionum* and *cæremoniarum impensæ*, implies nothing but what concerned the Continuation of Religious Societies, and the keeping up of some Ceremonies, as the Publick Entertainments, &c. that had taken their Original from gentile

that purpose in *Symmachus's* Request, and the Laws then in Force allowed Temples and Altars to stand in several Places where Sacrifices were prohibited.) They might have thus joined their own Enemies, either out of Complaisance to *Symmachus*, who held a Post of great Authority, and had undoubtedly a vast Influence on their Deliberations ; or for some other Reason scarcely to be guessed at present, but which must have determined several Christians at that Time not to oppose the desire of the Pagans, since (q), according to the Observation of the learned Fr. *Juret*, S. *Ambrose* himself tells us in another Place, that all *Valentinian's* Counsellors, both Christians and Gentiles, were for granting *Symmachus's* Request. However, St. *Ambrose* says positively (r), that the greatest Number of those

tile Superstitions, but were looked on by the Christian Emperors, as not inconsistent with Christianity. See *Constant's* Rescript in *Cod. Theod.* lib. xvi. Tit. 10. l. 3.

(q) See Fr. *Jureti* Miscellan. in *Symmach.* lib. 10. p. 298. & *Ambros. de obitu Valent.* ubi sup. p. 1179. Cum universi qui in Consistorio aderant, Christiani pariter atque Gentiles dicerent esse reddenda.

(r) *Ambros.* ubi sup. p. 840. §. 31. quo PLURES conveniunt Christiani. . . . obstringetur pia Senatus portio obtestantium vocibus, adjurantium Sacramentis ? And in his first Answer, before he had read *Symmachus's* Performance, ibid. p. 825. totus his Christianorum periclitatur Senatus. . . . cum majore jam curia Christianorum numero sit referta.

those who resorted to the *Roman* Senate were Christians, which is sufficient to determine the Question, as to *Symmachus's* Time: and therefore it would be needless to make any particular observation upon a Passage of *Zosimus* (Lib. iv. towards the End) which might be alledged in support of M. *Le Clerc's* Opinion, wherein that Author speaks of Requests offered by the Senate to *Theodosius* in favour of Paganism. It is also unnecessary to inquire into the Meaning of what St. *Austin*, (Confes. Lib. viii. cap. 2.) says of *almost all the Roman Nobility*; for the Passage is so intricate, and the M.SS. so different from one another, that nothing can be made of it.

To return to *Constantius*, what the Pagan Orator says of him, can never be reconciled with the most authentic Accounts we have of that Prince's Zeal against all Pagan Superstitions; except one supposes that, by a rhetorical Quibble, he makes use of such general Expressions as may, strictly speaking, be found agreeable to the Truth of the Facts, tho' they seem, at first, to import a great deal more. Thus he equivocates on the Word *Religiones*, that may signify the Colleges of Persons devoted to Religion, as well as the different Forms of Worship. *Constantius* had not destroyed those Colleges, nor taken their Revenues from them; but to say that he had preserv-

ed

ed in the Empire, (or, for the Empire, Servavit Imperio,) the Heathenish Form of Worship, is so directly contrary to the Laws of his making we have still, and to the unanimous Testimony of all Historians, that it can never be admitted.

Now to come to the mean Point, I think F. Hardouin might have alledged a Passage found by Onuphrius Panvinus, in an old Manuscript, and which that famous Antiquarian takes to have been written by a cotemporary Author ; it is there said that, while(s) *Constantius* was at Rome, the Roman People requested him to recal *Liberius* their Bishop, who had been banished before, and that *Constantius* complied with their Request, *Felix Liberius's* Competitor having been noted and expelled by the People and the Senate. If the Senate was not a Christian Body, I don't see how, under a Christian Prince as *Constantius*, it could interfere with the domestic Affairs of the Church. By *Theodore's* (t) account the Petition was offered by the Magistrates and principal Officers Wives, (*Cassiodorus* (u), a Senator himself says the Senators Wives) and the Wives's request to their
Huf-

(s) On. Panvin. Notæ ad Plat. de vitis. Pontif. in Fel. ii. Populus Romanus pro reditu Liberii supplicavit. Cui annuens Liberium ad urbem revocavit ; Felice a populo et Senatu notato & urbe pulso.

(t) Theod. Hist. Eccles. ii. 17.

(u) Cassiod. Hist. Tripart. V. 18.

Husbands, together with the Reason given by the Husbands for not offering the Petition themselves, leaves no Room to doubt but they were all Christians.

5. Christianity was in a flourishing Condition both in *Great-Britain* and in *Spain*; but as these Countries could not have any great influence on *Julian's* Affairs, I shall say nothing of them. I shall even forbear, (to avoid an unnecessary length) mentioning the vast Countries bordering upon the *Danube*; *Illyricum*, *Pannonia*, and others, which abounded with Christians; and content myself with referring the Reader to the Authors quoted in the (w) margin. But *Gaul* deserves a particular Attention, as it was there *Julian* had the first Opportunity of trying the Affections of the People. There is no need of taking any notice of the Dispute between (x) Mr. de *Launoy*, and Mr. de *Marca*; Tho' they differ as to the first preaching of the Gospel in some Parts of what

(w) See *Jerem. Collier's Eccles. H. of G. Brit. T. i. p. 26, 28, 30, 37. Mat. Parker de antiq. Eccl. Brit. p. 1, 8, &c. Fuller's Church Hist. of G. Brit. p. 2—8. 16. Gildas Ep. de excid, &c. Brit. p. 11. Spelman concil. Dec. &c. orbis Brit. T. i. de Exord. Chr. Rel. in Britannis. Nat. Alexand. Hist. Eccles. Tom. iii. p. 157. Sæc. i. Diff. 15. Fleury. Hist. Eccles. iii. p. 188. Magdemb. Cent. iv. cap. 2. Mat. Raderi Bavaria Sancta T. i. p. 6, 7, &c.*

(x) See *Pet. de Marca Epist. inserted in Hen. Vales. Eusebius, & Launoi's disjunct. Epist.*

what is now called *France*, neither of them questions its flourishing there in the Fourth Century, and it is a Point in which all Authors agree. The increase of Christianity had been stopped in some Measure, by *Diocletian's* Persecution in other Parts of the World; but *Gaul* had been free from (y) that Scourge, which was owing to its being under the mild Government of *Constantius Chlorus*: For, tho' Persecution raged every where else, (z) *the Nations that lay to the West of Italy, as the Gauls, the Britons, and the Spaniards, did not think it illegal to profess Christianity*, being ruled by a Prince, who openly favoured that Religion. Thus the Gospel was still propagated there without Interruption, and as soon as *Constantine* came to the Throne (a) *it was strengthened in Proportion as Paganism lost Ground, in such a manner that, (b) it is impossible to express the prodigious increase of the Gallican Churches at that Time.* One may form some Judgment of it by the number of Bishops who were present at the Council of Arles in the Year 314. *Isidorus*

(y) *Lact. de mort. persec. p. 29. Vexabatur universa terra præter Gallias.*

(z) *Sozom. I. 6. 'Ουκ ἔδοξε παράνομον Χριστιανίζειν τοῖς Ἰταλῶν ἐπὶ κλίμα, Γαλάταις τε καὶ Βρετανοῖς, &c.*

(a) *Ger. Dubois. Hist. Eccles. Parisiens. p. 35. See also Sozom. ubi sup.*

(b) *Guil. Marlot. Hist. Metrop. Remens. p. 178.*

dorus makes them six hundred, and by the lowest accounts they were 200. Now as 35 only subscribed, it is probable the Subscribers (twelve of whom belonged to Gaul) were the Representatives of the Churches of different Parts of the World; and the 565, or 165, who did not subscribe, had not been sent by their respective Churches, but came of their own accord, from the neighbouring Countries; and thus their number shews what a Figure Christianity made in those Parts. It is probable it continued to propagate itself during that whole Reign, and the succeeding ones, tho' we have no particular Account of the Manner. Under *Constantius* and *Constans* (c), all the *Burgundiones* became Christians, and the Wealth of the *Galic* Church, (which can scarcely be supposed to have accrued to it; except the generality of People were Christians) must have been considerable in the Year 359, when, as *Sulpitius Severus* tells us, the Bishops sent to the Council of *Ariminum* (d), thinking it indecent to receive the Allowance offered by the Emperor to bear the Charges of their Journey, chose to live at their own Expence. It is true, the same

Author

(c) See *Magdemburg. Cent. iv. cap. 2. p. 27.*

(d) *Sev. Sulp. Sac. Hist. lib. ii. in Bib. Pat. T. vi. p. 346.* Episcopis Annonas & cellaria dare imperator præciperat; sed id nostris indecens visum. Repudiatis fiscalibus propriis sumptibus vivere maluerunt.

Author says, that (e) before *Martin*, just at the Time of *Julian's* being in *Gaul*, there were but few Christians, and almost none at all in *Touraine*; but, besides this concerns but a small Tract of Land; it may be observed that *Gregory of Tours*, who must have known the Affairs of that Country, at least as well as *Sulpitius*, tells us (f) of a Bishop of *Tours* as early as the Emperor *Decius*, and there was no occasion for a Pastor if there was no Flock. Therefore it may be presumed that *Sulpitius* spoke hyperbolically, in order to extol *Martin's* Success, in bringing so many Pagans to the knowledge of the Truth. After all: by *Sulpitius's* own account, those who opposed *Martin's* destroying the Temples, were none but Peasants; for he always calls them *Rustici* or *Rustica Multitudo*. Thus he gives Reason to think that, at least, the Towns were favourable to Christianity, which may be confirmed from *Hardouin's* (g) Observation, that the Magistrates of the Towns, in *Gaul*, were Christians. This was a great Point at a Time, when there was

(e) *Id. de Vita S. Martini* cap. 10, *ibid.* p. 352. Et vero ante Martinum pauci admodum imo pœne nulli in illis regionibus [Turonum] Christi nomen receperant.

(f) *Greg. Turon. Hist. Franc.* i. 28.

(g) *Hard. Opera Selecta.* p. 117.

was but few Villages ; the (b) dread of the Incurfions of the Barbarians, having obliged almoſt all the Inhabitants of the Country in thoſe Parts, to retire within the walled Towns. *Julian* could not be ignorant of this ; and *Marcellinus* gives us to underſtand, that he knew, profeſſing Chriſtianity was the only means to gain the favour of the Majority of the People. Tho' he was a Gentile in his Heart, and ſecretly practiſed Idolatry, ſays that Author, (ſpeaking of the Time *Julian* aſſumed the Title of *Augustus*, being then in *Gaul*) (i). *He feigned to adhere to Chriſtianity, that he might draw every Body into his Party without Obſtacle, and publickly went to the Church of the Chriſtians on the Day of Epiphany, the better to conceal his real Inclinations.*

6. All the Provinces of the Empire being thus diſpoſed, in point of Religion : it was very natural the Armies ſhould be moſtly com-

(b) See La Bletterie Vie de *Julian*. p. 52.

(i) Am. Marcel. lib. xxi. 2. utque omnes nullo impediēte ad ſui favorem illiceret, adhærere cultui Chriſtiano fingebat a quo jam pridem occulte deſciverat, arcanorum participibus paucis, haruſpicinæ auguriis quæ intentus et cæteris quæ Deorum ſemper fecere Cultores, et ut hæc interim celarentur, feriærum die, quæ celebrantes menſe januario Chriſtiani Epiphania diſcitant, progreſſus in eorum Eccleſiam, ſolemniter Numine orato diſceſſit.

composed of Christians ; and they were really so, as far as the Accounts transmitted to us, can give information of that Matter. It appears, by *Tertullian's* Evidence, that there had been, pretty early, a considerable number of Christians in the *Roman* Troops. This is confirmed by several Edicts of the Persecutors, who ordered that the Christian Officers and Soldiers should be dismissed, or compelled to sacrifice ; a vain Precaution if there had not been a remarkable number of them. Not to run so far back, let us begin with *Diocletian*. By (k) *Lactantius* and *Eusebius's* account, his first Proceedings against the Christians was to the purpose I have mentioned. Whether they outwardly complied with the Emperor's Command ; or found some means to avoid being known for Christians ; or left the Service ; does not appear in History ; but an Event which happened a few Years after persuades me that a considerable part of the Army was still Christian before *Constantine* got the peaceable Possession of the Empire. *A Soldier*, says (l) *Zosimus*, having spoken some blasphemous Words against the Goddess

(k) *Lact. de Mort.* cap. 10. *Euseb. Hist. Ec.* viii. 1. & *Chron.*

(l) *Zosim. Hist.* ii. p. 84. βλάσφημα ῥήματα κατὰ τὸ θεῖον τῶν στρατιωτῶν τις ἀφ' αὐτῶν, καὶ τὸ πλήθος διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸ θεῖον ἐνστάειαν ἐπελθόντος ἀναιρεθεὶς, ἰκίνησε τὸς στρατιώτας εἰς γάσιν.

Goddeſs Fortune, the devout Populace that had run together, to ſave the Temple of that Deity from being reduced to Aſhes, murdered him; which excited a Sedition among the Soldiers then at Rome. It is probable that both that Blaſphemer of the Goddeſs, and thoſe who were ſo ſanguine in taking his part were Chriſtians; tho' (m) Mr. Fleury ſays that only the Man who was killed was a Chriſtian, but without giving any reaſon why we ſhould admit a Diſtinction between him and his Comrades. An Obſervation already quoted, out (n) of *Dodwell's Diſſertations*, about the Army's Behaviour to *Severus* and *Galerius*, ſhould rather incline us to think, that they generally were, either Chriſtians, or well affected to Chriſtianity. (o) *Licinius's* Ediſt, for diſmiſſing from the Service ſuch Officers as would not ſacrifice, is at leaſt an unqueſtionable Proof of there being a conſiderable number of Chriſtian Officers in his Troops, in the Year 320: and, to me, it makes it probable, that moſt of the Soldiers were Chriſtians too;

(m) Fleury Hiſt. Ecl. ii. p. 591.

(n) *Dod. Diff. Cyprian*, Diff. xi. § 77.

(o) Euseb. v. Const. i. 54. Mr. de Valois confines that Ediſt to the Guards of the civil Magiſtrates, but the learned *Beverige* (annot. in can. xii. Conc. Nic.) ſhews that it muſt be underſtood of the whole Army. See *Annot. varior. in Euseb. Hiſt. Ecl. x. 8. edit. Will. Reading.*

too ; for there appears no other Reason, besides the Fear of weakening his Army, why he should have confined his Order to the Officers, and not made it general, as other Persecutors had done upon the like Occasion. As for *Constantine's* Army, one might object that *Libanius* says of those who fought under him, they (p) *prayed to the Gods* before they began the Battle. But, tho' *Libanius* be a very good Evidence for Things that may have come within his personal knowledge: yet he is not so for what happened when he was but a Child, and in a Place very remote from that where he lived ; besides the Passage quoted is taken from a Discourse wherein (q) he commits several Mistakes concerning the History of *Constantine's* Reign. Therefore other accounts are preferable to his as to this Particular. However that Prince's Army soon became Christian, if it was not so from the beginning. Several Regulations mentioned by (r) *Eusebius* leave no room to doubt of it. The Troops saw, without murmuring, their Ensigns so altered as to have the Cross and the Name of Christ inscribed on them, instead of the Names

(p) *Liban. Or. pro temp* p. 9.

(q) See *Cave's Introd. to his Lives of the Fathers of the Fourth Century*, p. xv.

(r) See *Euseb. v. Const.* ii. 33, 44 iv. 19, 20, 21, &c.

Names and Images of *Pagan Deities*, (s) which was done, says *Sozomenus*, in order to use them to worship the same God with their Emperor. They all submitted without Reluctance, even those who did not profess Christianity, to make use of a Form of Prayer whereby Paganism was in a manner abjured; and we have reason to think that very few, if any, Pagans were left among them when *Constantine* died; since (t) every Legion had a Tent designed for Divine Service, and Christian Priests and Deacons appointed to celebrate the same according to the Rules of the Church. However: if the Scheme of converting the Army to Christianity was not as fully put into Execution under that Emperor, as he intended it should; it was resumed with Vigour and completed by his Sons. (u) *The Soldiers*, says *Theodoret*, talking of *Julian's* Time, had received the Doctrine of Piety. They had at first been freed from the former Seduction of Idolatry, and instructed in the Doctrines of Truth by *Constantine*, and afterwards more strongly

(s) *Soz.* i. 8.

(t) *Ibid.* τὰ ῥωμαίων τάγματα . . . ἕκαστον ἰδίαν σκηνὴν κατασκευάσαντο, καὶ ἱερέας καὶ διακόνους, &c.

(u) *Theod. h. E. iii. 3.* Ἐδίδου τοὺς στρατιώτας, τὰ τῆς εὐσεβείας ἰσοδιδυγμένους μαθήματα. Πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ αὐτοὺς ὁ πανυφημος Κωνσταντῖνος τῆς πεντήρατ' ἐξαπάτης ἰλευθερώσας ἐξεπαίδευσε τὰ τῆς ἀληθείας μαθήματα. Ἐπειτα δὲ οἱ ἑκείνων παῖδες βεβαιότερον ἐν αὐτοῖς τὴν παρὰ τῷ πατρὶος γεγεννημένην διδασκαλίαν ἐργάσαντο.

strongly confirmed by his Sons in the Religion they had received from the Father. Baronius (w) is of Opinion that the military Oath related by *Vegetius de re militari*, I. 5. wherein the Soldiers are made to swear by God and Christ, and the Holy Ghost, was introduced about that time. It was also under the Reign of *Constantine's* Sons, and probably in Consequence of an Edict published by *Constantius*; that the Word Pagan became to be understood of a Heathen. At least this is the Opinion of (x) Baronius and several other learned Men among the Moderns, who, talking of the Battle of *Mursa*, which was fought in the Year 351, say that *Constantius* had none but Christians in his Army; having before dismissed all the Heathen, and sent them to their respective Villages, or *Pagi*, from whence they got the Name of *Peasants* or *Pagans*. They add that this was the Occasion of St. *Martin's*, who was then but a Catechumene, receiving the Baptism; to avoid being dismissed the Service. It is true I can find no express words to that Purpose in any antient Author who speaks of that Battle; yet it agrees so exactly with all the Circumstances of that time, and with what *Theodoret* affirms

(w) Baron. Annal. ad A. 351.

(x) See Baron. ibid. Le Sueur Hist. Eccles. on the same Year. Job. Lati Compend. Hist. Univers. p. 102, &c.

firms of *Constantius's* Behaviour in his War against *Magnentius*, who was defeated at *Mursa*, that one can hardly question the certainty of *Baronius's* Assertion. But before we make any further inquiry into it, it is proper to observe that the Word *Pagan*, (as that (y) learned Cardinal shews beyond any possibility of Dispute in another of his Books) implied an exclusion from the Privileges belonging to Military Men. From which it follows, that the *Heathen* could never have the Name of Pagans appropriated to them, till, by some Law or other, they were made incapable of that Station of Life to which those Privileges were annexed. Now (z) *Godefreoy* and *Pagi* have proved that in the Year 365, the Word *Pagan* signified a *Heathen*, and was usually employed in that sense; and, as there was nothing done against those of that Religion, either by *Julian* who died in 363, or by his first Successors *Jovian*, *Valentinian*, and *Valens*; we must, of necessity, suppose, tho' there was no express mention of it in History, that some such Regulation as *Baronius* places before the Battle of *Mursa*, had been really made about that Time. But History

D

is

(y) Baron. Not. in Martyrol. Rom. Januar. 31.

(z) *Jacob Gotthof.* on the Title of Cod. Theod. xvi. Tit. 10. *Ant. Pagi* Crit. Annal. Baron. ad A. 351.

is not silent upon that Article ; for *Theodoret* expressly says (a) that *Constantius*, during the War against *Magnentius*, called his Army together, and advised every one to be Partakers of the Divine Mysteries, lest Death should surprize them unbaptized. Then, to enforce his Advice, he told them ; If any Body refuses to receive the Christian Habit, let him immediately retire and go home, for I will not suffer any to fight with me, who is not initiated. Two learned Men (b) *M. de Valois*, and *M. de Tillemont*, doubt the Fact, for this reason, that at that time *Constantius* himself was not baptized. But such an Authority as *Theodoret's* is not to be slighted upon such a pretence, chiefly when it is corroborated by such circumstantial evidence ; besides, the reasons urged by *Constantius* were not as strong for him, as they were for his Soldiers. They were really exposed to the dangers of War ; but, during the decisive Battle of *Mursa*, he took care to be out of harm's way, and (c) kept within the Walls of a Church,

in

(a) *Theod.* iii. 3. ἐν γὰρ δὴ τῷ πρὸς Μαγνήτιον πολέμῳ ἅπασαν συναλίσας τὴν στρατιάν, μετ' αὐτοῦ ἅπαντας τῶς Θεῶν συνεθέλευσε μυστηρίων. . . . εἶδεν τις τὴν δὲ λαβεῖν τὴν ἀμπεχόνην ἀναβάλλεται, νῦν ἐν τειχεῖ ἀπάρας διὰ δεξιᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀμυῶντος γὰρ συμπολεμεῖν ἢ ἀνέτοιμαι.

(b) *Valef.* in hunc locum. *Tillemont* H. des Emp. T. iv. p. 365.

(c) See *Sulpit. Sev.*

in company with a Bishop, who, I suppose, was ready to baptize him if things had come to that Pass that there could be any danger for his Life. Therefore his not being baptized, is no reason why he should not have commanded, that none should presume to fight in his Armies, without having previously received that Sacrament. But whether he did give such directions on that particular occasion or not ; it is plain, from several Circumstances, that the main part, at least, of *Theodore's* evidence is unquestionably true.

The Emperors were obliged, at that time, to pay such a regard to their Troops, that *Constantius* would never have dared to proscribe Paganism in the manner he did, had not the greatest part of his Army professed a Religion opposite to it. To the Laws by him made against Paganism, and which have been already quoted, must be added those that were promulged since *Julian* was *Cæsar*, and wherein that Prince is deemed to have joined with *Constantius*, as far as he had a share in the Administration of public Affairs. There were several, (d) as well in favour of Christianity, which got many new Privileges, as against the *Haruspices*,
D 2

(d) *Cod. Theod. lib. ix. Tit. 16. L. 4. 5. 6. Lib. xiii. Tit. 1. L. 1. Lib. xvi. Tit. 2. L. 13. 14. 15.*

pices, the *Augurs*, and all other kinds of Diviners: They were all condemned to Death, and the same Punishment inflicted on those who consulted them. There was one in particular, which made it (e) a capital Offence to pay any kind of Worship to Idols. Now, if the Soldiers had not been Christians, how could they have born such Laws? To come more particularly to those upon whose Affection or Disaffection Julian was to depend, we have all the reason in the world to think they were Christians. (f) Pomponius Lætus says, that Julian feigned to be a Christian, for fear of offending his Soldiers who were Christians. He concealed his Impiety, says (g) Theodoret, because he was excessively afraid of the Soldiers who were Christians. He knew, says Zonaras, that almost all his Soldiers were Christians. Marcellinus does not mention the Soldiers in particular, but says the same thing of the generality of the People: It is true, Julian wrote to Maximus, from Constantinople, or some other Place in Thrace, that

(e) Ibid. lib. xvi. Tit. 10. L. 9. *Pœna capitis subjugari præcipimus eos, quos operam sacrificiis dare, vel colere simulachra constiterit.*

(f) *Pomp. Lætus. R. Hist. compend. int. sylburg. H. R. script. T. ii. p. 543.* Ne, a fide abhorrens, animos militum alienaret.

(g) See *Theod.* words supra p. 59. Note u. Zonaras *Annal. T. iii. p. 19.* Εἰδὼς σχεδὸν ὅλην πάντας χριστιανὸς ὄντας.

that (b) the greatest Part of the Army about him was Pagan; but, when he wrote that Letter, he had had time to put in practice with the Troops he had with him, the Methods he used afterwards with all those in the Empire, to seduce them from Christianity, or, at least, to oblige them to give such outward Signs of their Approbation of Pagan Rites, as might intitle him to boast of their Apostacy: Besides, he expresses himself in such a manner as shews that it was quite a new thing, as any one that will take the trouble to read the Letter may easily see. But before he left Gaul, when he wanted to persuade his Army into that very Thing, leaving the West, the bare dread of which had engaged them to withdraw their Allegiance from *Constantius*, he spoke quite in (i) a Christian Strain, which he shoud, of all things in the World, have avoided, had he had the least notion of the majority of his Army being Heathen. The (k) Law he made to dis-mits the Christians from the Army, as *Theodoret* says, or rather from (l) his Guards only, (as it appears by comparing that Au-

D 3

thor

(b) *Ep. xxxviii. Max. Phil.* τὸ πλῆθος τῆς συνα-
τελόντος μοι στρατοῦ διὰ θεοσεβείας ἔστιν.

(i) See his Discourse, *Am. Marcel. xxi. 5.*

(k) *Theod. iii. 8.* Τέθεικ νόμον τῷ ἑκατομνῶν τῶν
τῆς στρατείας ἐκελύμεσθαι.

(l) *Socr. iii. 13.* Κατὰ τὰ εἰσέλματα.

thor with *Socrates*) the several (*m*) Stratagems he used to the Soldiers, to seduce them from their Faith; the Constancy of some, even of (*n*) whole Bodies, who persevered, notwithstanding all his Arts; and the Necessity he found himself under, of employing (*o*) those who still professed Christianity, are undoubted proofs that the greatest number of both Officers and Soldiers were Christians, before he came to the Throne. Had it been otherwise, he woud soon have gotten a Pagan Army: and *Jovian*, who had scarcely any personal Qualities that could enable him to wear the Imperial Sceptre, woud not have found that Army so ready to (*p*) declare itself Christian,

(*m*) See *La Blotterie V. de Julian*, p. 172. et suiv.

(*n*) By *Bonifus* and *Maximilian's* Exhortation to their Fellow-soldiers, one may judge that the whole Body of *Herculians* was composed of Christians. See *Tillemont hist. Eccles. T. vii. p. 406. Greg. Nazianz. T. i. or iii. p. 75.* Says, that many Soldiers withstood all his Arts, and that their number exceeded that of the 7000 who did not kneel down to *Babal* in *Elias's* Time.

(*o*) Not to mention the generally known Example of *Jovian*, I shall remark that *Jovinus* an Officer of Distinction, whom *Julian* found in *Gaul*, and employed frequently afterwards, was a zealous Christian. See *Marlot. Metrop. Rem. hist. T. i. p. 97.*

(*p*) *Rufin. H. Eccl. lib. xi. i. Omnes pari eademque voce respondisse perhibentur, et nos Christiani sumus.*

Christian, as soon as *Julian* was dead, rather than be without a Christian Emperor.

Thus I think I have made it appear that Christianity had so much the Advantage of Paganism, in point of Strength; when *Julian* either came to the Throne, or was thinking of making himself a Party; that, had that Prince been guided by political views, he would most certainly have stuck to the Christians, as the best able to support his Interest. I don't know but it might likewise be proved, that it was his real Interest to join with the Orthodox, who, tho' very numerous, were cruelly persecuted by *Constantius*, at the instigation of the *Arian* Faction; and who, for that reason, might have been presumed ready to side with any one who would have supported them.

DISSERTATION II.

Upon the Dissentions between the Orthodox and the Arians in Julian's Time.

Christianity had all the outward appearances of a very flourishing condition when *Julian* came to the Throne: yet its inward State was a deplorable one. Numberless multitudes had the name

of Christians, but Schism and Heresy had brought such a confusion in the Church, that true Christianity was very rare. To give a full Account of all the Dissentions of those times, would be the business, not of a short Dissertation, but of a large Treatise. The Christians were divided into so many Parties, that it would be almost endless to enter into the concerns of every one of them. But, as we are to consider the State of Christianity, chiefly with respect to the influence it had, or may be supposed to have had on *Julian's* Conduct, the best method for us, is to take notice of those Parties only, which made the greatest Figure, either in general, or in those parts of the *Roman* Empire, which *Julian* had opportunities to be the best acquainted with. Therefore, as the affair of the Donatists, tho' it made a great noise, and occasioned much trouble, was mostly confined to *Africa*, we shall forbear any further mention of it, and, in order still to keep closer to our subject, shall only consider that important and general business which engrossed the attention of almost all Christians at that Time, I mean the *Arian* Controversy. That Dispute is looked upon by some, as having been, either entirely, or at least in part, the Occasion of *Julian's* Apostacy. Let us inquire into the grounds of that opinion. I am very far from being a
Friend

Friend to Theological Disputes, and am persuaded they do more harm than good in the Flock of Christ. Yet as a Friend to Truth, I woud not throw the Odium of such an Event, as *Julian's* Defection from Christianity, on any particular Controversy, without some foundation for it in History; and I must own I can find no direct one in the present case.

A very learned Man, (a) who had a just detestation for Socinianism, and knew how much the principles of that Sect are destructive of Christianity, is of opinion that Eunomianism, (a Branch of Arianism not unlike *Socinianism*, and of which we shall speak in another Dissertation) prepared the way to *Julian's* Paganism; but he gives it only as a probable conjecture, grounded on the genius of the Eunomian Doctrine, wherein it is not improbable that *Julian* had been brought up. If there had been any direct foundation for this surmise in History, such a Man as Mr. *la Croze* woud not have overlooked it, and we may conclude from his silence, that there is none. As for his Conjecture, I woud by no means reject it, were there not strong (b) reasons to believe that *Julian* never was a sincere Christian of any denomination: and, not-

D 5

with-

(a) See *La Croze* *Reff. Sur le Mahom.* p. 87.

(b) See *Dissert.* iv.

withstanding my opinion in that Particular; I shall readily grant that Arianism, or rather Eunomianism, may have had some share, tho' not a direct one, in that Prince's falling into Paganism.

1. The unhappy Controversies of that time may very well have occasioned a dangerous neglect of Julian's Education, as to the Principles of Christianity. By perusing what is left of his Books against our Religion, one may judge that no solid foundation had ever been laid for his Belief in Christ. Had he known the Proofs whereon the truth of Christianity depends, he would certainly have endeavoured to destroy them; since his Design was (c) to *show the reasons he had to think that Christianity is nothing but an human Contrivance*; whereas he examines the Particulars of the Doctrine, without taking notice of the general proofs. Now that fault can be charged on none but the Chief of the Arian Faction at that time, *Eusebius of Nicomedia*, who was entrusted with the care of the young Prince's first Education: and it is not surprizing a Man of *Eusebius's* Character (as he is represented by (d) the Emperor

(c) Ap. Cyril. lib. ii. p. 39. Ed. Span. τὰς αἰτίας εἰσεσθαι ὡς ἂν ἐπίσθην ὅτι τῶν γαλιλαίων ἡ σπουδαία πλάσμα ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπων.

(d) In his Letter to the *Nicomeditans*. See *Cassius Lives of the Fathers*, p. 69.

peror *Constantine*) should have concerned himself very little about giving his Pupil a truly Christian Education. He, and indeed the whole Sect, cared for nothing but (e) to domineer over other Christian's Faith, and their greatest concern was, lest People should entertain too high notions of Jesus Christ. And how could such an Education enable *Julian* to withstand the Arguments of the learned Gentiles he since conversed with?

2. There was perhaps, more than a bare neglect of that Prince's Education. Considering the heat of the Disputes at that time, it is probable that young *Julian*, being in the hands of Arian Teachers, heard more of their particular Tenets, than of any other part of the Christian Doctrine; and one may venture to say he was bred up to hate the Asserters of our Saviour's Divinity, among whom he could not but find, (when he read the Scriptures) the Authors of the new Testament, or at least, as he tells us somewhere, St. *John* the Evangelist.

3. The Notions, which a common christian Education instills in Children, and which may have an influence over them when

(e) See *Am. Marcel.* xxi. 16. *Speaking of Constantius.* In quâ (Religione Christianâ) scrutandâ perplexius, quam componendâ gravius, excitavit dissidia plurima — ut Catervis Antistitum — ultro citroque discurrentibus per Synodos quas appellant, dum ritum omnem ad suum trahere conantur arbitrium.

when grown up, to keep them from Idolatry and Infidelity, were not instilled in *Julian*. The Principles of Arianism in general, are very unfit to warn one against Idolatry. *Julian* could not have, from his Education, that abhorrence for the worship of secondary Deities, which Christians generally have; for he had been taught, that Jesus Christ ought to be worshipped, tho' he was not that God who is above all, but only a kind of secondary Deity. The principles and method of the Eunomians, in particular, had used him to expect geometrical Demonstrations in religious matters, and consequently to set very little value on that submission, which a christian Education generally represents as essential to Faith. Thus, tho' he had adhered to the principles he had imbibed under his Eunomian Preceptors, (supposing he had sincerely embraced their Doctrine) he would have been still very little better than an Infidel: and so far it may be said that Arianism and Eunomianism contributed to his Apostacy.

Some modern Writers consider the Influence of that Controversy on *Julian's* Mind in a quite different Light. They imagine, (but generally give it rather as a conjecture of theirs, than as a fact warranted by antient vouchers) that *Julian* was scandalized at the manner in which the dispute was carried on, and took from thence

thence a dislike to Christianity. Father (f) la Bletterie mentions that conjecture, with several others of the same kind. May be, says he, Julian's first dislike of Christianity, was owing to his hatred to Constantius: The submission required by Christian Faith, may also have revolted his curious pride. He could not but be struck at the deplorable Dissensions wherewith the Church was then torn, chiefly at that scandalous dispute, whether Christ was the sovereign God or a meer Creature, at the decay of Piety among the Christians; at the violent usage the Arian Faction gave the Orthodox, &c. Another Author, who on this point, puts the Arians upon a level with the Orthodox, has gone so far, as to give the animosities between the two Parties, for the only known cause of Julian's Apostacy. For my part I can approve none of those opinions; but above all, I take it to be important to clear from the Charge of having contributed, in any wise, to that unfortunate change, those whom Mr. Whiston is pleased to call (g) Athanasians, tho' Athanasius was never looked on as the Contriver of a new System, by any body that had the least reading of the antient Christian Authors. The great service they have done Christianity, in pre-
serving

(f) Vie de Julien, p. 18.

(g) See Whiston's *primitive Christianity revived*; his *Historical Preface*, his *Account of the Convocation's Proceedings*, &c.

serving the true Doctrine of the Divinity of our Saviour, amidst the most cruel Persecutions of the Arians, deserve that such a respect should be paid to them by every true Christian, as not to suffer their memory to be blasted with a reproach of that kind, thrown indiscriminately upon them and their Adversaries.

Now, to form a right Judgment of the effects which the usage Christians of different Communion gave to one another, had on *Julian's* choice of a Religion, we must consider, 1st, what that Usage was at *Julian's* time, and in the Places he was the best acquainted with, and 2dly, what that Prince said of it.

I. *Arius* had begun to disturb the Church about 13 Years before *Julian* was born, and (b) as the Fire he had kindled was not immediately put out, says Hieronymus, it raged thro' the whole World. Yet he made loud complaints of the usage he met with from his Bishop *Alexander*, who, said he (i) persecuted him violently; for he seems to have been the first who brought under the name of *Persecution*, the precautions taken by Ecclesiastical Superiors, to preserve the purity of Christian Doctrine, and the restraints

(b) *Hier. in Ep. ad Gal. lib. 3. Edit. Martian. T. iv. p. 291. Arius in Alexandria una scintilla fuit, sed quia non statim oppressa est, totum orbem ejus flamma populata est.*

(i) See *Arius's Letter* ap. Theod. H. E. l. 5.

laid by them upon such of the Clergy, as would preach Tenets quite opposite to those of the Church they pretend to belong to. He was solemnly condemned in the Year 325, and some severities were designed against him and his Sectaries by the Emperor *Constantine*: but they did not take effect, or what took effect (*viz*) the Banishment of *Arius* and a few Bishops) was of a very short duration. I do not pretend to apologize for *Constantine's* severe resolutions against Men who might have a sound Conscience, tho' they had a perverse Doctrine: but as the Edicts of that Prince were not executed, and *Arius* was soon after recalled, I hope this can never be construed as a Proof of the Orthodox party's rigour to the Arians before *Julian's* Time. At least it shall never come up to what *Julian* knew, and had seen of the Arian rage against the Consubstantialists. (This is the name the Orthodox went by at that time.) As early as the Year 326, according to (*k*) *Sandius*, a most partial Arian Writer, tho' somewhat later, according to better accounts, *Constantine* was prevailed upon by his Sister *Constantia*, to recal *Arius* and his Friends. Accordingly they returned from their respective Banishments, without any opposition or molestation from the Consubstantialists. But as this act of favour had been obtained

(*) *Christ. Sand. Nucleus Hist. Eccles. lib. ii. p. 172.*

tained from the Emperor upon a false Exposition, and a kind of Recantation of the Arian Doctrine, and the Errors were not the less pernicious for their Author's being acceptable to the Prince, *Athanasius*, who had succeeded *Alexander* in the Alexandrian See, would not receive the Heresiarch into the Communion of the Church. This provoked *Constantine*, who was a very positive Prince, and, whether he wavered in the faith, or was persuaded that the Arians were not really Enemies to the Nicene Faith, it seems certain, by all accounts, that from this time forward the Court was constantly favourable to, and, in a manner, led by the Arian Faction. From this Period to *Julian's* Accession to the Throne, we find no less than 28 Councils of Arians of several denominations, who had mostly their determinations supported by the civil Power: and tho' the Consubstantialists had been willing to persecute their Adversaries, it is well known they were not in a condition to do it. It is true that two of *Constantine* the Great's Sons, *Constantine* and *Constans*, were favourable to them. But no instance is to be found in History (tho' we have Arian monuments) of their having used their Authority to distress the Arians. The only use they made of it, in favour of Orthodoxy, was to soften *Constantius* their Brother, into milder measures against the Consubstantialists, than those

those the Arians advised him to pursue; and an Author, who in several places of his works, seems to be a friend to the Arians, out of hatred to true Christianity, says, that at that time, † *to persecute for Religion, was by the Trinitarians then accounted an Arian, and unchristian tenet.* However, their Lives and Reigns being soon ended, the whole Empire was governed by *Constantius* alone, whose conduct particularly deserves to be considered, as *Julian* then began to be of an age to take notice of what passed. *Albanasus* suffered so many different Persecutions from the Arian Faction, both under *Constantine's* and his Son's Reign, that it would be endless to give a particular account of them; besides *Julian*, who was personally incensed against that great Man, does not seem ever to have been made sensible of his being unjustly persecuted. Therefore, as it would not be so proper to bring his personal sufferings into a Dissertation chiefly intended to inquire into that which *Julian* knew, I shall forbear mentioning that point. The Ecclesiastical Proceedings of the Arians against the Consubstantialists were numberless; but as far as they kept within the bounds of Church-discipline, it may be said they had a right, as they were the established Church, (no matter how they came to be so) to take care that

† *Blount's Oracles of Reason, p. 100.*

no Heretic, according to their own way of thinking, should enjoy the Livings designed to maintain the Teachers of the Doctrine then by Law established. Therefore I shall also lay that point aside. But what I cannot pass under silence is, that not content with those Prerogatives which it would be unreasonable not to allow to those whose Religion is established by Law, that party committed all kinds of Outrages and Excesses against the Orthodox.

i. Such as did not think it lawful to communicate with the Arians had not the Liberty to form separate Meetings, for the Exercise of their Religion. This appears from what passed between *Constantius* and *Atbanasius*, when the latter, at the earnest request of *Constantius*, was permitted to return to *Alexandria*. The Emperor desired *Atbanasius* that he would grant (1) one of the Churches under him to his Adversaries, which the Bishop readily granted. But at the same time he begged of the Emperor, that those who were opposed to the Arian Doctrine might have a single Church allowed them (m) in every City.

Constantius

(1) *Sozom.* iii. 20. Ἐκ πολλῶν τῶν ὑπὸ σὶ ἐκκλησιῶν.

(m) *Sozom.* iii. 20. *Theod.* ii. 12. & *Rufin.* x. 9. represent *Atbanasius*'s Request as relating to the City of *Antioch* only where this was transacted. But *Sozocrates*, ii. 23. p. 113. makes it general καθ' ἑκάστην πόλιν; and from all Circumstances his Account is the more to be depended on.

Constantius could not deny that the request was fair and just, and would have granted it, had he not been prevented by the *Arians*, who were sensible of the superiority the *Consubstantialists* would always have, wherever they should be allowed freely to preach their Doctrine, and exercise their Religion.

2. The least thing a Bishop could expect when he refused to subscribe the Arian Professions of Faith, was an (n) *Exile to such remote Countries* that it was a kind of Transportation. *Liberius* of *Rome*, *Paulinus* the Metropolitan of *Gaul*, *Diomysius* the Metropolitan of *Italy*, *Lucifer* the Metropolitan of *Sardinia*, *Eusebius* an *Italian* Bishop, were all sent into Exile (a), under no other pretence but their refusing to subscribe to the Arian Heresy. *Ammianus Marcellinus*, a Pagan Author, took notice of the Case of *Liberius*, who was banished, because (p) he would not condemn *Athanasius* without hearing him; and that account exactly agrees with the Conference between the Emperor and that Bishop, which has been transmitted to us by *Theodoret*. Many more Bishops shared the same fate, whose

names,

(n) *Theod. ii. 5.* Τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἡγουμένων ὧς τὰς τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐσχάτας οὐσίας κατακρίθηναι.

(o) *Athan. T. i. p. 322.* Ἐκρίθησαν πρόφασις εὐδὲ μὴ ἐχόντες ἢ δαί μὴ συνέβαινεν τῇ ἀρεσκυνῇ αἰφάνει.

(p) *Am. Marcel. xv. 7.* *Liberius* . . . perseveranter renitebatur nec visum hominem nec auditum dampnare . . . aperte scilicet recalcitrans imperatoris arbitrio.

names, taken from all the Ecclesiastical Writers of those times, would make up a long List, tho' it is not to be supposed but that some were omitted in the accounts that have come to our hands. The Arians did not spare even those whom they had preferred themselves, when they found they had been mistaken in the opinion they had of their Doctrine. They had transferred *Meletius* from *Sebastia* to the See of *Antioch*, but (q) they drove him into exile, because, contrary to their expectation, he began to preach the *Orthodox*, and not the *Arian* Doctrine.

3. The Exiles had many things to suffer in their banishment. Several were imprisoned, loaded with chains, exposed to all kinds of affronts and ill usage, till they died miserably; as was the case of (r) *Lucius* of *Adrianopolis* who had often born their chains, and at last died in prison. Some were (s) beaten and tortured, as *Osius* a venerable old Bishop, till they consented; some (t) were condemned to death, and

would more Bishops shared the same fate, who
(q) *Rufin. Hist. Eccl. x. 24.* Ab ipsis rursus in exilium traditur quod contra opinionem ipsorum non Arian sed nostram fidem cepit in Ecclesia predicare.

(r) *Athanas. ii. p. 321.* Τον πολλάκις παρ' αὐτῶν καὶ αἰκναις φορέσαντα, καὶ ὥτως ἀποθανόντα.

(s) *Socr. ii. 31.* Πληγαῖς τε καὶ τρεβλώσεσι τὴν περισσότῃ προσέφερον.

(t) *Athanas. ubi sup.* ὡς ἐν ἀσπιδόμην κεφαλῆς ὑποσυνάτι τιμωρίαν.

would have suffered, had not they withdrawn themselves, as *Theodatus* and *Olympius* Bishops of *Thrace*, and several of *Athanasius's* Priests; some were put to death, as (u) *Paul* of *Constantinople*, who, after being banished to *Pontus*, then carried Prisoner to *Singara* in *Mesopotamia*, and from thence to *Emesa*, was at last brought to *Cucusum* in the deserts of *Mount Taurus*, and there starved almost to death for six days, and ἀποκρυγας strangled by *Philippus* the Governor of the Province, one of the Ministers of the Arian rage.

4. The several Communities, as one may imagine, were neither well pleased to see their Bishops, who had constantly edified them with the soundness of their Doctrine and the sanctity of their Morals, thus taken from them: nor disposed willingly to see others intruded in the vacant Sees. Therefore it was found expedient, by the Arians, to make use of a military Force; and it became customary to have (x) Bishops forcibly installed by the Army. Thus *Gregory* forced his way to the *Alexandrian* See, with no less than (y) five thousand Men, supported

(u) See *Theod.* ii. 5. *Athan. ad Monach. de bist.* *Arian.* T. i. p. 348.

(x) *Athan. ad Monach.* T. i. p. 389. Μετὰ στρατιωτῶν ἐπισκοπῆς ἀποπέμπει πρὸς τοὺς μὴ θέλοντας λαοίς.

(y) *Socrat.* ii. 11. *Athan. Epist. Encyclica.* T. i. p. 112, &c. *Socrates* mistook the Name of the Governor

supported by the whole Arian Party, and as many Heathen and Jews as they could get to join them. *Julian* was but a Child when this happened in the Year 341, and therefore he may be thought never to have heard of it; but he can by no means be supposed to have been ignorant of what passed at *Constantinople* ten Years after, when *Macedonius* was installed by *Philip* the Captain of the Guards, and in the Year 356, when his friend *George* was intruded into the *Alexandrian Church* (2). *Macedonius*, immediately after the lawful Bishop *Paul* had been seized and sent a ship-board to be banished, went to Church with *Philip* in his chariot, being surrounded with Soldiers who frightened the People with their naked swords; and upon the false supposition that there was a design to oppose them, because the Croud was so thick that they could not get thro', the Soldiers fell upon the unarmed Multitude, in such a furious manner, that three thousand one hundred and fifty Men perished in that occasion. It was by the same means that *George*, (whose Character

nor who headed that Expedition, and called him *Syrianus* instead of *Philagrius*. *Syrianus* commanded at another Arian Expedition a few Years after, when *George* was intruded into the same Sec.

(2) *Socrat. ii. 16.* ὡς ἐκ μηχανῆς τινὸς παρὼν ὁ Μανεδέ-
ιος, ἐν τῷ ὄχηματι σὺν θρόνῳ, τῷ ἐπάρχῳ . . . στρατιωτικῇ τε
χαρὶ ἐπιφάνῃ, περὶ αὐτοῦ, ἐτύγχανε δεῖος δὲ ἐν ἰσθμῷ καὶ λαλα-
σκεῖν τὰ πλεόν.

Character drawn by *Marcellinus* may be had from *Father la Bletterie*) was made Bishop of *Alexandria*. The Emperor (a) sent him there with an Army, and ordered him to be introduced by the power of the General, which was effected with much Bloodshed and numberless Outrages, an account of which is contained in the complaint of the *Alexandrians*, and in several of *Athanasius's* Letters. Thus it may be seen how justly *Helladius*, a *Luciferian* introduced by *Hieronimus*, reproaches the Arians with having (b) their hands filled with Blood, and making use of the Soldiers weapons instead of the pen to confute the *Consubstantialists*.

5. The Persecution was not confined to some particular Places, or Persons. The Laity had its share in it, as well as the Clergy, and complaints were brought from all places to the Synod of *Sardica*, (c) of
 ' some that had been threatened ; others
 ' condemned upon false and suborned ac-
 ' cusations ; some beaten ; others wounded ;
 ' and some directly murdered ; many load-
 ed

(a) *Athanasius ad Monachos*. ii. p. 389. Προέταξεν αὐτὸς ἀλλο-
 τήτων ἐπισκοπεῖν μετὰ στρατιωτικῆς φαντασίας καὶ τῆς τοῦ
 στρατάρχου ἐκουσίας.

(b) *Hieron. Dial. cont. Lucifer*. cujus manus sanguine plenæ sunt, cujus stilus lancea militis fuit.

(c) *Cave, Lives of the Fathers*, p. 116. *Cave* says nothing but what agrees exactly with the Letters written by the Synod to *Julius of Rome*, to the *Alexandrians*, and to all the Churches. See *Hardaini Concilia*, T. i. p. 653, & seq.

' ed and almost strangled with Iron chains;
 ' more imprisoned, some whereof were
 ' stifled with the noisomeness of the Prison;
 ' multitudes banished, and that in the most
 ' miserable and uncomfortable places where
 ' Hunger and Nakedness could not fail to
 ' dispatch them. Churches had been set on
 ' fire; devout Virgins stripped and rifled;
 ' and the common Goals filled with Men
 ' of the holy Order; and this for no other
 ' reason, but because they refused to enter
 ' into the Arian Communion. All which
 ' was ready to be attested, partly by the
 ' Confessors themselves then present in the
 ' Council, partly by Deputies sent by those
 ' that were absent, whole Churches having
 ' sent Commissioners to represent their
 ' complaints and grievances to the Synod.'

6. It is impossible to express the numberless Barbarities that were committed in several places, by those who were at the Head of the Arian Faction. (d) *Sebastian*, a *Manichee* who acted under *George* at *Alexandria*, being informed that the Consubstantialists, deprived of their Churches, were gone out into a Church-yard to their Devotions, went thither with his Soldiers, and made a violent assault upon them. Then he caused a fire to be made, to which he brought the holy Virgins, to force them to say they were Arians, and as they refused

(d) See *Athan. de fuga sua*. T. i. p. 323.

refused it, he beat them so cruelly on the face, that for a long time after one could scarcely know them. Forty Men were so unmercifully beaten with thorns newly cut, that some with difficulty recovered after a tedious cure, and others died of it. As many as could be taken were banished. I give this only as a sample of the Arian method of making Converts; for to give a full account of what *George* did of that kind would be endless. Enormities of the same sort were (e) committed at *Cyzicum* by *Eleusius*, and at *Constantinople* by *Macedonius*, who invented unheard of torments to force the Consubstantialists to turn Arians, and, not satisfied with his own Diocese, persuaded the Emperor to send four Legions into *Paphlagonia* in order to preach his doctrine there. But the Country-people seeing what sort of arguments were made use of to persuade them, had recourse to the same, and defeated the Emperor's Troops; I might add many facts more, but I do not intend to write a History of that Persecution. A sketch is sufficient to my purpose.

7. Yet I must mention one particular more. The Arians were not satisfied with putting the Consubstantialists to death. They wanted to have them unburied. *Gregory,*

E

(e) See *Socrat.* ii. 38.

gory, the first Intruder into the *Alexandrian* See (f), persecuted an Aunt of *Athanasius* so unmercifully, that after she was dead he would not let the Corpse be buried, and it would really have been thrown on a dunghill, had not it been for some persons who deceived his rage. The bodies of those who had been killed, in the aforementioned expedition of *George* and *Sebastian*, were (g) at first refused to their Relations, who wanted to bury them, and thrown away without burial: and it seems it was customary with them thus to use the Orthodox, by what *Theodoret* relates of an exhortation directed by *Athanasius* to some of his Flock. (b) Let none of you be sorrowful, says he, because the wicked hinder your bodies being buried. For the *Arians* carry their hatred so far that they lock up the burying places, and sit like Demons by the graves, lest some of our dead should be laid in them.

The

(f) Athan. ad Mon. ii. p. 351. Τοῦ ἐπισκόπου θείαν οὕτως εἰδὼς ὡς μὴδὲ ἀποθανοῦσαν ἀφείναι ταφῆναι, καὶ τοῦτ' αὖν ἰγγόνει καὶ ἀταφος ἐβρίφη, &c.

(g) Ath. de fuga, T. i. p. 323. Τὰ δὲ σώματα . . . οὐδὲ τοῖς ἰδίοις κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀποδοθῆναι πεποιήμασιν, ἀλλ' ἐκρύψαν ὡς ἠθέλησαν ἀταφα ἐαλόντες. See also, p. 388.

(b) Theod. ii. 14. Μὴδὲ γενέσθω τις ὑμῶν περίλυπος· εἰ καὶ θλαπτομένοις ὑμῖν φθονοῦσιν οἱ δυσσεβεῖς, καὶ κωλύουσιν τὰς ἐκφοράς. καὶ μέχρι γὰρ τούτων ἡ καὶ λασροφὴ τῶν Ἀρειανῶν ἐφθάσε. καὶ τὰς μὲν πύλας κλείουσιν, περὶ δὲ τὰ μνημεῖα ὡς δαιμονες καθέζονται· ἵνα μή τις τῶν ἀπογενομένων ἀποτεθῇ. See Athan. vitam, a monach. Bened. Athan. oper. præfix. p. lxvii.

The Reader may observe that in the foregoing account, I have taken no notice of the outrages committed by the Populace in Seditions and Tumults. Let it be of what Religion you please ; it is always Populace, and of consequence unruly. The Leaders of a Party may have some influence on it ; but as it may likewise rise without their intervention, it would be very unjust to charge them, without special proof, with the disorders committed upon such occasions. This is a piece of injustice which *Sabinus* a *Macedonian* Bishop has been often guilty of in his (now lost) Ecclesiastical History, wherein *Albanasius* was charged with all the mischief that was done in the several Tumults and Seditions occasioned at *Alexandria*, by the severe and unjust orders that frequently came from Court against him. To avoid the like reproach, I have charged nothing to the account of the Arians, but what was done by Authority.

Now, before I come to *Julian's* own evidence, the Subject requires I should clear *Albanasius* and the Consubstantialist Party, from two calumnious aspersions thrown on them by *Sandius*. The first concerns the death of *Gregory*, who was intruded into the *Alexandrian* See, in the Year 341, and died six Years after. *Theodoret* (mistaking *Gregory* for *George*, of whom

we shall speak by and by, as it has been remarked by M. de Valois, and W. Lowth, and is well known to all those who ever looked into the History of those times) says in one place that this Gregory was (i) slain by the Alexandrians; and in another that he was torn to pieces by the Sheep of the flock, he had used like a Wolf: The silence of Philostorgius, who would never have omitted such a Story, had it had the least foundation, tho' it was but in common report, is a sufficient proof of the mistake; but Sandius greedily takes hold of the blunder, and roughly handles the (k) Consubstantialist Sheep, whom he charges with that supposed murder. Had he stopt there, I would not have used the harsh word, Calumny: but he goes further; and forges a Testimony of Theodoret, in order to blacken Athanasius's memory (l). Theodoret, says he, quoting ii. 4. 11. 16. Says that Athanasius seized the vacant See, Gregory having previously been murdered by the Alexandrians, not without suspicion of Athanasian bribery. Let Theodoret's History be perused from beginning to end; and not a single

(i) Theod. ii. 4. 12.

(k) Sandii Nucleus. Hist. Eccles. ad A. 342. p. 191.

(l) Sand. ubi sup. ad A. 349. p. 215. non absque suspitione subornationis Athanasianæ.

single word of that pretended bribery shall be found in it.

The other Calumny concerns that very *George*, whom *Theodoret* mistakes in several places for *Gregory*, and I must own *Sandius* is not he first Contriver of the Story; but as he could find it in no Author without its being refuted at the same time it was related, he may deservedly pass for a Calumniator, since he gives the Story as absolutely true, without even mentioning its being contradicted. After giving an account how *George* was used by the furious Rabble of *Alexandria*, (m) *this was done*, says he, *by those of Athanasius's Party, who were there-to incited by his Advice, and I remember to have seen the Tripartite History quoted, as saying that George had been poisoned by Athanasius.* Let us begin with the quotation out of the Tripartite History. The book was not so scarce, but a Man who wanted to favour the Publick with *the Kernel of Ecclesiastical History*, might easily have found it out, and examined whether it really had, what he pretends to remember he had seen it quoted for. But then he would have found that *Cassiodorus* had not a word to that

E 3

purpose,

(m) *Sandius* ad A. 364. p. 246. Clades hæc *Georgio* inflicta fuit per fautores *Athanasii*, hujus sententia eis ducatum præbente. Memini me allegatam legere tripartitam, quasi dicat *Georgium* ab *Athanasio* veneno peremptum.

purpose : and tho' he had, it is so notoriously certain, that George was barbarously murdered in a Sedition of the *Alexandrians*, and not poisoned ; that the Story did not deserve admittance into *Sandius's* Performance. Now, to come to the mean point, it is true (n) *the Arians said that George had suffered by the Means of Athanasius's Friends*, and got that Story (o) *spread about* ; but it is equally certain that the Story was false ; for tho' *Socrates* says in general, that *such as are prompted by hatred usually join in Seditions against wicked Men*, he adds, that the Emperor's Letter charges the People of Alexandria, *rather than the Christians* ; and *Sozomenus* says positively that it was done by the *Gentile populace*, τὸ ἑλληνικὸν πλῆθος. *Philostorgius* himself durst not even insinuate that any Christian joined in that Sedition. He only says that *the Pagans* did it (p) *by the advice of Athanasius*. But how improbable is that Story, that *Athanasius* should have had such an influence over the Heathen, who looked on him as the greatest Enemy of their Religion, as may appear from *Julian's* evidence ! Now the innocence of the Consubstantialist is proved, beyond any possibility of doubt, by the evidence

(n) *Sozom. V. 7.*

(o) *Socrat. iii. 3.*

(p) *Philost. vii. 2.* τὸ ἑλληνικὸν . . . καὶ πρὸς Ἀθανάσιον γνώμην ἐρατήσασιν τῆς πράξεως.

dence of *Marcellinus*, who describes the whole affair very particularly, and not only relates circumstances which prove that none besides Heathen could join in that Sedition; but says positively that (q) *the Christians might have interposed*, which supposes manifestly that the only share they had in that Tumult, was that they remained idle Spectators of it. Had they behaved in another manner, *Julian*, who never missed an opportunity of bringing them to trouble, (as may appear (r) by his confiscating all the property of the *Arian's* Church at *Edeffa*, on the occasion of their behaviour to the *Valentinians*) and (s) had a particular inveterate hatred to *Atbanasius* and his friends, would not have failed to make them feel his resentment in a severe manner. But let one read (t) the long Letter he wrote to the *Alexandrians* on that affair! He throws the whole blame of it upon the Gentiles, whom he pardons in consideration of their God *Serapis*: and after Christians have been found guiltless by *Julian*, shall they be accused by *Sandius*?

II. The longer I have been examining what usage the two Parties, which made the greatest Figure among the Christians,

E 4

at

(q) *Am. Marcel. xxii. 11.*

(r) See *Julian*, Ep. liii. *Hecebolio*.

(s) See *Julian*, Ep. li. *Alexand.*

(t) *Julian*, Ep. x. *Alex.*

at *Julian's* Time, gave one another, the less shall be required, to inquire into the effects which that usage had on him. The *Arian* Persecution was so publick, so barefaced, so overbearing, so general, and so cruel, that it was not possible *Julian* should be ignorant of it. On the other hand, the Orthodox were kept so low, that, tho' it had been their inclination to persecute, it was not possible *Julian* should know any thing of it by experience. Therefore we can blame none but the *Arians*, for the bad impression that Prince had of Christians on that account. (u) *He had experienced*, says Marcellinus, *that most Christians*, when divided in their opinions about Religion, *are greater Enemies to one another, than any wild Beast is to Mankind.* *Julian* himself exclaims against that rage wherewith he had seen *Heretics* persecuted. (x) *You have cruelly murdered*, says he to the Christians, *the Heretics engaged in the same errors with you, because they did not mourn for the dead Man in the same Manner as you do*; and in another place; (y) under my

(u) *Am. Marc. xxii. 5.* Nullas infestas hominibus bestias ut sunt sibi ferales plerique Christianorum expertus.

(x) *Jul. ap. Cyril. vi. p. 206.* Ἀπεσφάζατε . . . τῶν ἱερέων; ὁμῶν πεπλανημένων αἱρετικῶν τοὺς μὴ τοῦ αὐτοῦ τρόπου ὑμῶν τὸν νεκρὸν θρηνοῦντας.

(y) *Julian, Ep. lii. Bostrenis.*

my Predecessor, many Galilæans have been persecuted, banished, imprisoned; great multitudes of those they call Heretics have been slain, as in Samosatum, in Cyzicum, in Paphlagonia, in Bithynia, in Galatia, and in many other Countries, where even several whole Towns have been entirely destroyed. The Mention he makes of Paphlagonia, agrees so well with the expedition related by (z) Socrates, that there can be no doubt of the outrages here spoken of, having been committed by the Arians against the Consubstantialists. These were called Heretics by the Arian Party, as Sandius (a) proves it by several Authorities, and were the only sufferers in the Persecutions Julian had been a Witness of during his Predecessor's Reign. It seems even, by what (b) Hilarius of Poitiers says to Constantius, that Julian, whilst a Cæsar, had interposed to moderate the violences of the Arians in Gaul.

The conclusion I would have the Reader to draw, from all that has been said on this subject is, that supposing Julian became an Apostate, either entirely, or partly, because that the animosities he saw among

E 5

the

(z) Socrat. ii. 38.

(a) Sand. Nucleus Eccl. Hist. p. 140. 141.

(b) See Hilarii opera, Col. 1225. Paris 1693. qui plus in exilio meo contumeliæ a malis, quam ego injuriæ, pertulit.

the Christians his Contemporaries prejudiced him against our Religion, the blame of it is to be laid entirely on the Arians, who were so much accustomed to take violent measures against those who differed from them in point of Doctrine, that, even under *Julian's* Reign, they could not refrain from that method. That Prince informs us that (c) *Those of the Arian Church had committed such excesses at Edessa against the Valentinians, as could never have happened in a Town where the Laws had any Authority:* But as angry, and as willing as he was to find fault with *Athanasius*, he could never lay any particular fact to his or his Friend's Charge. All he had to say was, that *Athanasius* was (d) *an Enemy to the Gods, a Man by whose means all the Gods came to be despised, and who compelled some few Gentile Women to be Christened, which we have reason to suppose, was effected by force of Argument.*

But, to say what by all accounts seems to be true, *Julian* never was prejudiced against

(c) *Jul. Ep. xliii.* Οἱ δὲ τῆς Ἀρειανικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπιχείρησαν τοῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ Οὐαλεντίνου, καὶ τετολμήκασιν ταυσαυτὰ κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν, ὅσα ἔδειπτε ἐν ἐνοικουμένη πόλει γένοιτο ἄν.

(d) *Jul. Ep. vi.* Ὁ Θεοῖς ἐχθρὸς. . . τῇ αὐτῇ χεὶρὶ πάντων με λοπεῖ τὸ καταφρονεῖσθαι τὰς Θεὰς πάντας. . . ἐτόλμησεν ἑλληνίδας ἐκ' ἐμῆ γυναῖκα τῶν ἐπισήμων βαπτίσει διώκεισθαι.

against Christianity by that consideration. Besides he lays no stress on it in the books purposely written to account for the motives of his change, it must be observed that, in his way of thinking, the Spirit of Persecution was a fault of the Christians, not of their Religion. (e) *This is yours*, says he, upbraiding them in general with that Spirit, which was especially the Arians, *For neither Jesus nor Paul ever laid down such Rules for you.*

DISSERTATION III.

Upon Julian's real Sentiments on Religion.

AS Julian's departing from the Profession of Christianity was owing neither to Policy, nor to any dislike taken at the dissentions then raging among the Christians, so it is agreed, by all who ever read either that Prince's writings, or those of any of his Contemporaries, that his adhering to Pagan Rites and Superstitions was the

(e) *Jul. ap. Cyril. vi. p. 206. ἀλλὰ ταῦτα ὑμέτερά μᾶλλον εἰσίν. Οὐδαμῶς γὰρ ἔτι Ἰησοῦς αὐτὰ παρέδωκε κείμενα ὑμῖν, ἔτι Παῦλος.*

the effect of conviction. Yet Mr. *Thurzlaernleszki*, in a (a) Pamphlet lately written, purposely, as it seems, to abuse the Fathers, is pleased to say, that (b) by all the Monuments we have (the Writings of the Fathers only excepted) *Julian* appears to have been *not so much a Heathen as a Free Thinker or a Deist*, and to have had a vast contempt for the erroneous tenets and superstitious practices of the Pagans. Some of my Readers may perhaps be of opinion that I should have despised such a bold assertion of a solitary Writer, who is not likely to be credited by any one who has the least notion of *Julian's* character, and especially as, upon a former occasion, I have de-

(a) *De Pseudomartyria Patrum exercitatio prodroma, in qua nova, aut parum huc usque trita, ad historicæ veritatis investigationem via sternitur, et Metaphysices usus in describendâ historiâ ex eo præsertim adstruitur, quod Patres aliique Orthodoxi (falso sic dicti) Scriptores Studio partium magis quam rerum veritati ut plurimum consuluerint. Auctore Duspisto Thurzlaernleszkio Cosmopoli. 1744.*

(b) Sic Egregium imperatorem Julianum (quem ex universis quæ ad nos usque pervenerunt monumentis, si eorum [Patrum] calumnias et convicia excipias, non tam gentilibus accensendum esse quivis facile cognoscet, quam iis quos bonarum artium nutrix Angliæ libere cogitantium nomine insignit, quique alibi terrarum *Deistarum* nomine gaudent) ut Ethnicorum superstitionibus & figmentis impense et ex animo faventem irident, quæ pro suo ingenio fieri non potest quin contemptui habuerit. *De Pseudomartyriâ, &c. p. 7.*

demonstrated beyond all possibility of contradiction, 1st, That all Critics and modern Historians (c) not so much as a single one excepted, have unanimously taken *Julian*, not for a downright Hypocrite, or a Time-server, but for a sincere, and even a most superstitious Heathen ; 2dly, That these learned Men's notion of *Julian* is agreeable to all the accounts given, not only by the Fathers and other antient Christian Writers, whose evidence Mr. *Tb.* would slight, but by all the Pagan Authors who ever spoke of that Prince's Religion : And lastly that, by the account *Julian* gives of his own Sentiments, as well in his letters to his most intimate Friends, as in his other writings ; he was not only a *Theist*, (which word Mr. *St. Hyacinthe* should have made use of as *Cudworth* and other Authors (d) have done for distinction sake, instead of the word *Deist*, when he speaks (e) of *Plato*, *Socrates* and *St. Austin*) but a Polytheist, a bigoted worshipper of the many Deities he imagined to have been entrusted with the Government of this World, by the

(c) If Mr. *Thurzlaerniszki* should hereafter quote any Authority to disprove what I say ; that Author's usual method gives me reason to warn the Reader not to depend upon such a quotation, till he has consulted the book referred to.

(d) See *Le Clerc Bibl. chois. T. vii. p. 37, &c.*

(e) *St. Hyacinthe Recherches Philos. p. 55.*

the supreme God, and the most superstitious observer that ever was, of all the Pagan Rites and Superstitions; which he considered as established by Divine Revelation. It seems I might rest satisfied with being supported by such a *cloud of Witnesses*; but Mr. *Th.* who sets up Metaphysics instead of Evidence for the supreme Judge of Historical disputes, would never yield to such arguments. I am therefore willing to handle the same question over again, because I consider it as being of a greater consequence than at first it seems to be.

I. As a Man of Letters I take it to be a thing of Importance, in point of historical curiosity, to know the real Sentiments of one who made a considerable figure not only among the Princes, but likewise among the Philosophers of his age.

II. As a Christian, and a Minister of a Religion grounded upon Facts, I can never call Historical Pyrrhonism an indifferent thing. But, in my opinion, a plain Contradiction of any Fact unanimously warranted by all the historical vouchers we are able to come at, is a step towards such a Pyrrhonism; and more so, when those vouchers are called upon to prove what they directly contradict; for it is not to be presumed that every Reader will go and search the original Authors to judge of their true

true meaning. Such as have seen them quoted as saying that *Julian* was a bigoted Pagan, and find them referred to by Mr. *Thurzlaernleszki*, as saying quite the reverse; will be apt to think that no certainty is to be attained by reading historical monuments. It is true the Author of the *Pseudomartyria Patrum* was single in his opinion when he committed it to the Press: but his decision is brought in with so much confidence, that it can scarcely fail of gaining credit, and of being transcribed by others. Thus a single authority may be henceforth multiplied into a thousand, and the confusion which groundless assertions have already introduced into History, be increased to such a degree, as to make it very difficult to discern Truth from Falshood.

III. The manner, in which the notion of *Julian's* not being sincere in his Profession of Paganism is affirmed, makes it in some measure necessary to inquire into the matter. For there can be no doubt but that the cause of true Christianity will be better served by evincing the truth of what the Fathers have told us, from unsuspected Authors, than by letting aspersions be thrown at random on the sincerity of those Writers, who were the Asserters of our faith in former ages. This very reason has induced two great Men, Mr. *la Croze* and

and Mr. *Leibnitz*, to judge that it was not proper, in an Age where Infidelity and contempt of Antiquity seem to thrive apace, to let accusations laid by modern Writers to the charge of the Fathers, pass unobserved. “ It is now become fashionable (f), says the former, to attack the Fathers, and Ignorance, it is imagined, recommends itself this way. But those who raise a cry against them do it mostly with so little Judgment and knowledge of what they are about, that there is room to judge that Posterity will be amazed at the Impudence of some Scriblers of our Age, who imagine they get fame by crying down Authors whom they would reverence, if they had a true zeal for Christianity.” “ I side with you (g), says Mr. *Leibnitz*, in an observation upon his friends reflexion, against those who give themselves a loose to abuse the Fathers upon all occasions The contempt of the Fathers, when excessive, reflects back upon Christianity itself. If it has not been propagated by truly pious and knowing Men ; what opinion must we entertain of it? Thus

(f) *La Croze* *Refl. sur le Mahom.* p. 35. This excellent little treatise of Mr. *La Croze* upon *Mahometanism* and *Socinianism* was translated into English and published London 1712, together with several other treatises concerning *Mahometanism*.

(g) *Ibid.* p. 168.

Thus much being premised upon the Importance of the question in hand, I come to the mean point: and first I beg leave to single out of many Evidences, which I might mention in support of those already quoted in a former Dissertation of mine upon this Subject, two learned Men, whose authority cannot fail of going a great way towards the determination of the question, with those who know that reading the Antients is the only safe method to come at the knowledge of Antiquity. The first is the famous Dr. *Samuel Parker*, afterwards made Bishop of *Oxford*, who, when he was but Master of Arts, published a *free and impartial Censure of the Platonic Philosophy*, wherein he expresses himself to the following purpose (b). “The later
 “Platonists or second School of *Plato*, de-
 “generated into the basest and foulest Su-
 “perstitions especially those of
 “them that did most pythagorize, as
 “ the Emperor *Julian*.” The more he read, the more he was confirmed in that notion of *Julian*’s being a superstitious Man, and, in a book printed fourteen years after the *Censure*, he gave the following Character of that Prince. (i)
 “He

(b) *A free and impartial, &c.* p. 48.

(i) *A Demonstration of the Divine Authority of the Law of Nature, and of the Christian Religion* by Sam. Parker D. D. Archdeacon of Canterbury, p. 396.

“ He was the fiercest of all the Enemies
 “ to Christianity the bottom of all
 “ his zeal was nothing but Pedantry and
 “ Superstition ; for he valued himself
 “ upon his zeal for the old Super-
 “ stition, of which he was so childishly
 “ fond, that it exposed him even to the
 “ contempt of the superstitious Rabble it-
 “ self”. He was addicted to (k) *the only*
superstitious Sect among all the Philosophers,
the Pythagoreans, who were all along so
zealous of the Grecian Rites, that they may
properly be styled the Monks and Friars of that
Religion (l). “ It was this wild
 “ zeal lighting upon his Temper naturally
 “ hot to a Degree of MADNESS, that trans-
 “ ported him into all his extravagant
 “ attempts against the Christians. But as he
 “ was not naturally capable of any sober
 “ reasoning, so much less in this case,
 “ &c”. The second Evidence, (which I
 was helped to by a Person whose name
 would be an honour to this Dissertation,
 was I at liberty to mention it) is the lear-
 ned Dr. Bentley, who, upon *Anthony Collins*
 having made use of *Julian’s* Authority
 against Christianity, in his *Discourse of*
Free Thinking, rebukes that Author in a
 pretty rough, but well deserved manner.
 “ The

(k) Ibid. p. 392.

(l) Ibid. p. 397.

(m). “ The Banter, says he, came more
 “ decently out of *Celsus* an *Epicurean*’s
 “ mouth, than out of *Julian*’s the most
 “ bigoted Creature in the World. He to
 “ laugh at Expiation by Baptism, whose
 “ whole Life after his Apostacy, was a
 “ continual course of *nadappoi*, Washings,
 “ Purgations, Expiations, with the most
 “ absurd Ceremonies? Addicted to the
 “ whole train of Superstitions; Omens;
 “ Presages; Prodigies; Spectres; Dreams;
 “ Visions; Auguries; Oracles; Magic;
 “ Theurgic, Psychomantic? Whose whole
 “ Court consisted in a manner of *Haruspices*
 “ and *Sacrificuli*, and Philosophers as
 “ silly as they? Who was always poring
 “ in the Entrails of Cattle to find Futurity
 “ there? Who, if he had return’d Victor
 “ out of *Persia* (as his Pagans Friends jest-
 “ ed on him) woud have extinguished the
 “ whole Species of Bulls and Cows, by the
 “ number of his Sacrifices. I have drawn
 “ this Character of him, continues Dr.
 “ *Bentley*, from his own writings, and the
 “ Heathens his Contemporaries, that I
 “ might not bring suspected testimonies
 “ from Christian Authors . . . nor
 “ could the Philosophers ever have made
 “ him apostatize, but by infatuating him
 with

(m) Rem. upon a late Discourse, &c. by Phil.
 Lipfienfis Part ii. p, 24.

“ with Superstitions. However
 “ our modern (n) Atheists can never reckon
 “ him on their side among the list of *Free*
 “ *Thinkers*.” But what Dr. Bentley judged
 to be impossible, has been effected thro’ Mr.
Tburzlaernlezki’s wonderful Metaphysics :
 for notwithstanding that Author’s first setting
 out with the pretence of having his decisi-
 on warranted by all antient Monuments;
 but the Fathers, he has nothing to support
 it but mere reasoning on the nature of phi-
 losophical Understanding, or rather on the
 consequences of a Man having the name
 of a Philosopher. Now to serve him in
 his own way, I shall proceed to inquire
 into *Julian*’s real Sentiments, by way of
 reasoning ; but my conclusions shall be
 drawn from plain matters of Fact, not from
 bare Names and Presumptions.

Tho’ Men’s Words and Writings give
 great insight into their Sentiments ; yet we
 cannot rely entirely upon them, so as to de-
 cide from their Evidence alone, what any
 Person’s real belief is. Actions speak the
 mind much better, and afford much
 stronger proof. I shall therefore, take a
 survey of *Julian*’s conduct, and follow
 him thro’ every Stage of Life from the
 time

(n) Dr. Bentley constantly calls thus all the Enemies
 to revealed Religion, whether they admit of a Deity
 or not.

time he is universally allowed to have been an Apostate; (for what preceded is the subject of another Dissertation,) down to his fatal Expedition into *Persia*.

Let us first consider that Prince in his private Life, since his twentieth Year, till, being made *Cæsar*, he got some share in the Government. That Period deserves a particular attention, because in it he seems to have fixed upon that System of Religion which he afterwards steadily kept to. His Brother being now made *Cæsar*, he had the liberty to come, from *Macellum in Cappadocia*, where he had been confined, to *Constantinople*. There he applied himself, for a while, to all kind of Learning, chiefly to Eloquence; but was soon sent back to *Asia*, with liberty of going to *Nicomedia*, or any other Place he chose. His fondness of Learning, and dislike to all Christian Masters, brought him to *Pergamus*, where *Eufesius* the most Learned and (1) most superstitious Disciple of the famous *Jamblicus* taught Philosophy. *Julian* heard his Lectures assiduously and greedily for some time; and afterwards, by his Advice, those of two of his Disciples, *Chrysanthius* and *Eusebius*. But tho' he was fully satisfied with them, he left them suddenly upon an occasion well worth our particular notice, as it gives

(1) See Eunap. in Eufesio.

gives more light into his real Sentiments, than any other circumstance of his Life.

The Philosophy or *gentile* Theology of that time, (for the meaning of the two words is the same) had added several things to *Plato's* System. Amongst other Improvements, it had built upon the foundation of *Plato's* good and evil *Dæmons* the Doctrine and Practice of *Theurgy*. Most *Philosophers* were so many *Magicians*, as one may see by *Eunapius* his Lives of *Jamblicus*, *Edesius*, *Maximus*, *Chrysanthius*, &c. who thought that *Spirits* or *Dæmons* both good and bad could be evocated by certain Rites and Ceremonies; but confined themselves to the evocation of good ones; and pretended to be by them enabled to perform Wonders. Yet some few Schismatics had no faith for those Miracles, and despised *Theurgy*, insisting, that the only way to happiness was to follow Virtue, and make one's Reason as perfect as possible. These were, at least with respect to the former, a kind of *Deists*. It seems *Eusebius* was one of them; for his Lectures, like a Song, always ended with that Burthen.

“(u) This is what may be called solid Truth: As to the Wonders of the pre-

tended

(u) *Eunap. in Maximo.* Ὡς ταῦτα εἶη τὰ ὄντως ὄντα· αἱ δὲ τὴν αἰσθησὶν ἀπατῶσαι μαγανεῖαι καὶ γοητεύσαι, θαυματοποιῶν ἔργα, καὶ πρὸς ὑλικὰς τινας δυνάμεις παρακρίωνται καὶ μεμνηνότες.

“ tended workers of Miracles, they are but
 “ Illusions and vain Occupations of de-
 “ ceiv’d Men, who have a correspondence
 “ with Material Powers.” *Julian* desired
 him to explain himself; not understanding
 what he meant, and got this Answer.
 “ (x) *Maximus* is one of the ablest Disciples
 “ of *Edeſius*, but he runs into a kind of
 “ Madness. He brought us all, once to
 “ *Hecate’s* Temple, and, after ſaluting the
 “ Goddeſs, bad us ſit down: Friends,
 “ ſays he, you ſhall ſee whether I am no-
 “ thing more than a common Man. We
 “ ſat down: He purified a grain of incenſe,
 “ and muttered I know not what *Hymn*.
 “ Immediately the Statue of the Goddeſs be-
 “ gan to ſmile. We were affrighted; but he
 “ bad us be eaſy. This is but a trifſe ſays
 “ he; the Lamps the Goddeſs holds in her
 “ hands ſhall light of themſelves: As he
 ſpoke

(x) Μάξιμος . . . ἐπὶ μανίας τινὰς ὀρμήσας . . . συ-
 τεκάλησεν ἡμᾶς, . . . εἰς τὸ Ἐκατήσιον . . . καθῆσθαι μὲν
 εἶπε πρὸς ἡμᾶς . . . καὶ τὸ μάλλον ὁρᾶτε, καὶ εἰ τι διαφέρω
 τῶν πολλῶν ἐγὼ . . . χόνδρον καθαρίσας λιβανωτῆ, καὶ πρὸς
 ἑαυτὸν ὄντινα δῆποτε ὕμνον περαίνων. Εἰς τοσόνδε παρήλθεν
 ἐπιδείξιος ὥστε τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἐμειδία τὸ ἄγαλμα, ἔπειτα καὶ
 γέλως ἦν τὸ φαινόμενον . . . ταραχθήτω γε ὑμῶν ὑπὸ τῷ
 μηδὲ εἰς αὐτίκα γὰρ καὶ αἱ λαμπάδες ἀνάψοισιν ὥς ἐν ταῖς
 χερσὶν ἡ Θεὸς φέρει· καὶ τὰς λόγους ἐφθανε τὸ φῶς ταῖς λαμ-
 πασι περιφλεγόμενον· ἡμεῖς μὲν ἐν τὸν θαυμάσιον ἐκείνον
 θαυματοποιὸν πρὸς τὸ παρὸν καταπλαγέντες ἀνεχώρησα-
 μεν· σὺ δὲ τῶν μηδὲν θαυμάσης ὥσπερ εἰδὼς ἐγὼ· τὴν διὰ
 τῆς λόγου κάθαρσιν μέγα τι χεῖρμα ὑπολαμβάνω.

“ spoke they were so. We were struck
 “ for a moment with the Performance of
 “ that Miracle-monger : But there’s nothing
 “ in all this that gives me or is worth giv-
 “ ing you the least admiration. The main
 “ point is to purify our Reason.” Had
Julian entertained any inclination to Deism
 or Freethinking, such a Discourse must un-
 doubtedly have fixed him in the choice of
Eusebius for his Master. But instead of
 that, he left him abruptly : (y) *Keep your*
Arguments and read your Books, says he ;
Maximus is the Man I must look for. Immedi-
 ately he set out for *Ephesus*, where that Phi-
 losopher was ; and by his, and *Cbrysantbius*’s
 means, was afterwards initiated to the Mys-
 teries of *Theurgy*. Here we may observe,
 that not only *Julian* did not embrace the
 Doctrine of *Deism*, but even rejected it
 with contempt : And further, that the
 point of *Theurgy* was not the only one
 wherein he declared against the *Freethinkers*
 of his Age. He called them ironically
wise Men to excess, and chose to credit the
 most fabulous Stories of Wonders, with the
 Multitude, rather than side with them in
 their Unbelief : (z) *I know*, says he, talking
 of

(y) Ἐρῶ σο ἵπτι καὶ πρόσκει τοῖς βιβλίοις, ἐμοὶ δὲ ἐμ-
 νουσας οὐ ἐζήταν, καὶ ταῦτα ἱππῶν, ἐπὶ τὴν Ἐφεσον ἐξώρ-
 μησι.

(z) Jul. Orat. in Mat. Deor. Καὶ τοι με εἰ λέληθεν
 ὅτι φήσουσιν αὐτὰ τίνες τῶν λίαν σοφῶν ὕθλως εἶναι γραϊδίων
 καὶ ανεκτῆς, &c.

of the ridiculous story of that *Vestal Nun*, who was reported to have hauled up the *Tiber* with her girdle, as a proof of her Chastity, a Ship that no other force could move; I know that some, who are too wise, will say that these are old *Women's Tales*; but for my part, I will rather credit the *Traditions of wealthy Cities*, than the *Judgment of such wise Men*. The name of *Atheists*, wherewith he used to insult the *Christians*, may be also considered as a proof of his aversion to *Deism*. He never charged them with having no *God* at all. They were *Atheists* to him, only because they refused to acknowledge a multitude of *Gods*; but in that sense *Deists* are *Atheists* as well as *Christians*; and had he been one, it is not at all probable he would have given them that name which always carries a reproach with it. But this by the by: Let us return to *Julian's History*.

That Prince remained with *Maximus* and *Chrysanthius*, as long as he could learn any thing from them; but as his superstitious Curiosity prompted him to dive as deep as possible, into the secrets of *Theurgy*, and as he apprehended the two Philosophers were in that respect inferior (a) to the *Eleusinian Hierophantes*, he went to *Athens*, and

(a) Eunap. in Max. Ἀκούσας τὸ πλεονεῖν αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὴν ἡλλάδα παρὰ τῶν τῶν Θεῶν ἱεροφάντη, καὶ πρὸς ἐκείνων οὕτως ἔδραμε.

and found there what he wanted. Soon after, *Gallus* having fallen a sacrifice to *Constantius's* Jealousy, *Julian*, who was about twenty four, lost his Liberty for seven months, then recovered it, went back to *Athens*, and after a while received orders to repair to *Milan*, where the Court was.

His behaviour as to Religion during these changes of Fortune is very remarkable. Whether he then entertained any hopes of raising himself to the Imperial Dignity is doubtful; but, if he did, his conduct is not to be accounted for, except one admits that he was blinded with zeal. Paganism and Christianity were then in such a condition that (barring the confidence he reposed in the Gods adored by the Gentiles) he could have no prospect of rising by turning from the Latter to the Former. Experience had shewn that Christianity was no obstacle, nor Paganism an help to the Throne, but rather the reverse; since no Heathen Pretender had been able, as yet, to withstand a Christian competitor. He had several Friends among the Gentiles indeed. But what were they? Grammarians, Philosophers, Sophists, Poets, and other Men of Letters. But at that time Learning was not any more than at present, such a considerable thing in the World, that learned Men could at pleasure dispose of the Imperial Diadem. If *Julian* had no thought of making

making himself Emperor, at least he must have regarded his own safety and quiet. Now his change, had it been known to *Constantius*, must inevitably have involved him in numberless Difficulties. That Prince had a great zeal for Christianity, tho' *not according to knowledge*, and his (b) known Character and Behaviour leaves hardly any room to doubt but he would, in that case, have destroyed *Julian* as he had the rest of his Family upon much slighter pretences. He was sensible of his danger, and no other reason can be assigned for his dissembling his Apostacy during *Constantius's* Life. Whilst he was in *Asia* his Brother *Gallus* having overheard something of his (c) *Inclination to Paganism*, dispatched *Aëtius*, to bring him back, if possible, to the sound Doctrine. But *Julian*, instead of fairly owning what he since gloried in, (d) pretended to be still a Christian. Yet his zeal for Paganism was so inconsiderate, and consequently so sincere (for caution always attends hypocrisy) that he scarcely concealed his inclination that way. It was no great secret in *Asia*, since his Brother heard it: and how, notwithstanding his exterior

F 2

shew

(b) See T. Gordon's vii. polit. disc. upon Tacitus.

(c) Πρὸς τὸν ἑλληνισμὸν ἐκεῖνον ἀποκλίνειν. Philostor. iii. 27.

(d) A Letter written to him upon that Occasion, is preserved among *Julian's* Works, p. 454.

shew of Christianity could it have been one, when he so publickly went from place to place wheresoever he could find most Superstition; and when (e) so many Pagans flocked about him, for no other visible reason, but his fondness of their Religion? It seems the same of it had even gone thro' the greatest part of *Europe*, as far as *France*; since, a very short time after, an old blind Woman had no sooner heard that he was making his entry into *Vienne*, but she cried out; (f) *This is the Man who will restore the Temples of the Gods.*

While at *Athens*, he was not satisfied with paying his Adorations to the Gods in private, with the *Hierophantes*; he did it in a manner publickly. At least (g) he calls many *Athenians* to witness, that, before he left that City to repair to Court, he did in their presence lift up his hands towards the Citadel, where the Temple of *Minerva* was, and devoutly offered his Supplications to that Goddess. Had he had no other aim but to ingratiate himself with the Pagans, the consideration of the impending danger he exposed himself to by so public an Act of Idolatry, at a time when it was
so

(e) See *Liban. Epir. in Jul. Or. x. p. 265, 266.*

(f) *Am. Marcel. xv. 8. hunc Deorum templa reparaturum.*

(g) *Jul. Ep. ad S. P. Q. Ath. p. 275. Πολλοὶ τῶν παρ' ὑμῶν ἀρχαῖοι ἐστὶ μοι μαρτυρεῖς.*

so severely forbidden, and when he himself was so liable to be suspected at Court, and closely watched, woud have diverted him from it. But with him, Prudence always gave way, whenever Superstition was concerned; of which we have a very notable instance in the (b) fate of a Letter he wrote about that time or a little after. He designed that Letter for the Empress *Eusebia*, and the sending of it was the most adviseable step his own prudence coud suggest to him, in order to extricate himself out of some very great difficulties. Yet, before he sent it, he woud advise with his Gods. *Jupiter*, if we may credit *Julian*, was against the message; and of course the Letter was suppressed.

Julian had been called to Court, to be declared *Cæsar*; and was soon after sent into *Gaul*, with all the pomp, but very little of the power belonging to that Dignity. The bloody fate of his Father, all his Relations, and lately of his Brother *Gallus* sat heavy on his mind. He knew what he had to expect from *Constantius*, if that weak and cruel Prince, shoud take any umbrage or dislike at him. Deprived of all his own Servants, but one, he was obliged to have about him, instead of a Court, a multitude of Spies always ready to turn Informers.

F 3

What

(b) Ibid.

What was then his behaviour as to Religion? A *Deist* would certainly have kept at the greatest distance possible, from a Religion contrary to several Laws in force, some of which he had been obliged to publish jointly with *Constantius*. But *Julian* could not refrain from exercising his Religion, at least in secret. As (i) he was not at liberty to declare his sentiments, he used to get up every night, and (k) secretly prayed to *Mercury*. The only Servant of his own he had been permitted to keep, (l) *Oribazius* his Physician, was also at first the only Confident of his Idolatry, which (m) they practised secretly together as well as they could. But he soon got some few others (n), with whom notwithstanding his fears, says *Ammianus*, he used to apply himself to several kinds of Divinations, as well as to whatever else the worshippers of the Gods have always done. He even got an (o) *Hierophantes* or *Heathen*

(i) Liban. Epitaph. p. 265.

(k) Am. Marc. Lib. xvi. cap. 5. *Occulte Mercurio Supplicabat.*

(l) See *Eunap.* in *Oribaz.*

(m) Ep. ad S. P. Q. Ath. p. 277. Καὶ ὡς ἐνεδέχεται λάθρα συμπράττων.

(n) Am. Marc. lib. xxi. cap. 2. *Arcanorum participantibus paucis, Haruspicinæ auguriisque intentus, & cæteris quæ Deorum semper fecere Cultores.* Id. lib. xxii. cap. 5. *Multa metuens tamen agitabat quædam ad id pertinentia, quantum fieri poterat occultissime.*

(o) *Eunap.* in *Max.*

then Priest from Greece, to assist him in his Superstitions. These were also the Friends to whom he communicated his pretended Visions and Revelations (p). He acquainted them with a Vision he had at Paris, the night before the Imperial Dignity was conferred on him, and with another he had afterwards. He fancied he had seen the Genius of the Roman Empire, in one of these Visions, and the Sun, his favourite God, in the other, who both encouraged him not to lose the opportunity that offered. Tho' he was proclaimed Emperor by the Army, yet, as he wanted to keep upon good terms with Constantius, and seemed to be satisfied with the Empire of the West; his unexpected rise wrought at first no visible alteration in his manners. He had policy enough to profess himself still a Christian; but he continued his secret practices, chiefly those whereby he imagined to get a foresight into what was to befall both him and Constantius. He himself says, that he (q) consulted the Gods, tho' he durst not do it publickly. However; Constantius having no mind to part with any portion of the Empire, Julian was forced to resolve on fighting; and led his Army, with an incredible

F 4

(p) Am. Marc. lib. xx. cap. 5. & lib. xxi. cap. 2.
Zosim. lib. 3. p. 711.

(q) Epist. xxxviii. Max. Phil.

dible rapidity, from *Gaul* through *Germany*, and the vast Countries known at present by the names of *Hungary*, *Slavonia*, *Serbia*, and *Bulgaria*, to the very frontiers of *Thrace*; in order to go and meet his Concurrent. He was convinced, it seems, that success depended on swiftness. Yet he stopt at *Nissa*; and that because (r) *the entrails of victims*, his *dreams*, and his *observations of the Stars*, were so many signs of the pleasure of his Gods, whereby he was required to stay there for a while; besides his *skill in divinatory Arts*, gave him reason to think that *Constantius would soon die*; and this is not laid to his charge by the *Fathers*, but related as a matter of fact, by two credible Pagan Historians, *Zosimus* and *Ammianus Marcellinus*.

It is worth observing, that, during this uncertain State of *Julian's* Affairs, his Paganism did him no manner of service, and he was aware it might have proved fatal to him, if he had not taken care to behave in such a manner in publick, that Christians imagined he was still theirs. He himself informs

(r) *Zosim. T. iii. Rom. Hist. Script. sylburgii, p. 712. Am. Marcel. lib. xxi. cap. 1. Coniiciens eum Constantium) per vaticinandi præsagia multa, quæ calabat, et somnia, à vita protinus excessurum. Id. lib. xxii. cap. 1. Julianus, inter multa quæ per Illyricum agitabat, exta rimabatur assidue, arisque suspiciens præscire festinabat accidentium finem.*

informs us that, even after throwing off the mask of submission to *Constantius*, he was still afraid of something, and durst not openly profess himself a Pagan. Then, says he, (whilst on his Way to meet and fight *Constantius*) (*s*) *I inquired from the Gods, not in person indeed, for I durst not, but I ordered others to do it for me.* At that time, he could dread nothing, but an insurrection of the Christians, in favour of *Constantius*, had they known him to be a deserter of their faith. Policy forced him to profess himself a Christian (*t*). *That he might draw every body into his party without obstacle, says Ammianus, he feigned to stick to Christianity, which he had long before secretly abjured.*

A new scene is now going to open. During *Julian's* stay at *Nissa*, *Constantius* died, and, as he had no other Competitor, he immediately got a peaceable possession of the whole Empire. By this time he had entirely thrown off the mask, and declared himself a *Pagan*: but not satisfied with a fruitless declaration of his sentiments, he began to shew the most fervent zeal for the Religion he had imbraced. (*u*) *As soon as his*

F 5

fears

(*s*) Ἀυτὸς μὲν ἔτολμων. Jul. Epist. xxxvii. Max. Phil.

(*t*) Am. Marcel. xxi. 2.

(*u*) Am. Marc. lib. xxii. cap. 5. Ubi vero abolitis
quæ

fears were over, says Ammianus, and he saw himself at liberty to do what he pleased, he discovered the secrets of his heart, and gave plain and absolute orders, that the temples should be opened, and that victims should be brought to the Altars, to worship the Gods. He found means to bring his Army, if not to his way of thinking, as it appeared afterwards, at least to his way of acting. (x) Now, says he in a Letter to Maximus the Philosopher, we do publicly revere the Gods, and the greatest part of our Army joins with us in the worship of the same. We do publicly sacrifice Oxen, and have offered to the Gods several Hecatombs of Thanksgiving. These were his beginnings, and, as long as he lived, he daily gave so many extraordinary marks of his zeal, that it would be too tedious, to continue the account throughout his whole Life. Therefore, since there was no alteration in his conduct, with regard to this particular, to the time he was killed in Persia, I will only mention some of the most remarkable circumstances of his religious behaviour.

1. The

quæ verebatur adesse sibi liberum tempus faciendi quæ vellet advertit, sui pectoris patefecit arcana, et planis absolutisque decretis aperiri Tempia, arisque Hostias ad-moveri ad Deorum statuit cultum.

(x) Jul. Ep. xxxviii. Maximo. Θεσηκένουμενον τῶς Θεῶς ἀναφανδόν· καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῶ συγκατελθόντος μοι στρατοπέδου θεοσεβείας ἐστίν. . . . ἐμὲ κελεύουσιν οἱ Θεοὶ τὰ πάντα ἀγνέειν εἰς δύναμιν. καὶ πείθομαι γὰρ καὶ προθύμως αὐτοῖς.

1. The choice of his Friends deserves a particular Attention. *Libanius* tells us (y) in several places, that both in his Friendship and in his Hatred he had no bias but that of Religion. He himself declares, that the right of hospitality, so sacred among the Ancients, was not such a strong tie upon him, as that which arose (z) from the Instructions *Maximus* had given him, and from that Philosopher's piety towards the Gods. The most intimate of his Friends were, besides that Philosopher, the Sophist *Libanius*, *Priscus*, and *Chrysanthius*. They were all infatuated with Theurgy to the highest degree; but *Maximus*, above all, was the most superstitious Man that ever breathed; one may easily judge of it by perusing his (a) Poem *περὶ καταρχῶν*, wherein he shews the most childish dependance on every thing that he imagined was a means of looking into futurity. This was the Man who instructed *Julian*, and from whose principles that Emperor never departed.

2. One of his greatest *Foibles*, as well after, as before he was made Emperor, was to trust to all sorts of *Divinations*; and

(y) *Liban. Epitaph.* in *Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. vii. p. 286, 288, 314, 366.*

(z) *Julian. Epist. 39.* ὅτε διὰ τῆς ἐδεχομένης παιδείας, καὶ τῆς περὶ τὰς θεῶν εὐσεβείας.

(a) That Poem is to be found in *Alb. Fabr. Bibl. Græca. T. viii. p. 415.*

and *Libanius* praises him for having added to his other qualifications that of a Soothsayer. (b) *The same Man*, says he, was a Priest ; an Author ; a Soothsayer ; a Judge ; a General. There was no kind of Divination but he made use of, if any credit may be had to (c) *Ammianus Marcellinus* ; and I can find but (d) one single instance in his Life, in which he did not act agreeably to the answers he got from the *Haruspices*. He carried this so far, that the wisest political motives could not prevent his pursuing a scheme that might have easily turned to his ruin. *Hadrian*, who, they say, before he was Emperor, had been apprised of his future grandeur, by throwing a green leaf into a certain Well near *Antioch*, being afraid lest some body should be encouraged by the same means to conspire against him, had got the Well filled up, and tho' a very superstitious man, was prevailed upon by his fears to stop *Apollo's* mouth. But that fear, reasonable as it was, could not get the better of *Julian's* foible. (e) He wanted to have the Well opened again, at all Hazards.

3. Had

(b) Lib. Parent. in Jul. Orat. ap. Eab. Bib. Græca. T. vii. p. 312. Ὁ αὐτὸς ἱερεὺς, λογογράφος, μαρτυρῶν, δικαστὴς, στρατιώτης.

(c) Am. Marcel. lib. 22. cap. 12.

(d) Ibid. lib. xxv. cap. 2.

(e) Am. Marc. lib. 22. cap. 12.

3. Had the restoration of Paganism been but a political Scheme of *Julian*, he would have been satisfied with restoring it to the lustre it had before *Constantine's* Reign. The most zealous Heathen, at that time, desired no more. But this did not satisfy *Julian*. He (*f*) revived several orders of Priesthood that had been forgotten long before, undoubtedly for this reason, that no God of any degree should be without a proper Worship: for he did not stick to some particular God, and neglect the rest of the heavenly Court, or chuse a particular method of Worship, and never mind the others. But he served (*g*) as many Gods as the Poets have mentioned; Fathers and Children; Gods and Goddesses, superior and inferior Deities: He honoured them with Libations; crowded all their Altars with Rams and Oxen; and if any other method of Worship was known upon any particular occasion, he always conform'd to it, witness his (*b*) devoutly kissing the Feet of *Apollo's* Statue in *Daphne*.

4. I

(*f*) Liban. Monod. in *Juliani cædem*. p. 253. Edit. Morel.

(*g*) Ibid. p. 252. Ὅσους οἱ ποιηταὶ παρίδοσαν, πατέρας τε καὶ παῖδας, Θεῶς τε καὶ Θεῶν, ἀρχοντας τε καὶ ἀρχομένους· ἰσπίνδι τε καὶ τὰς ἀπάντων ἰσλήρη βωμὸς ἀρνῶν καὶ βοῶν.

(*b*) Liban. Monod. in *Apol. Temp.* p. 185.

4. I have taken notice in another place, of his valuing as much the Title of *High Priest* as that of *Emperor*; but lest any body should imagine he had nothing of a Priest of Idols but the name, *Libanius* tells us that (i) ‘both in the knowledge and practice of all that belongs to sacred rites he excelled the most experienced Priests; that he offer’d sacrifices to the *Sun*, every Morning and every Evening, and that there was no function belonging to that Office which he did not perform often and with alacrity: whereof his very fingers bore witness, for he did not spare his own trouble, either in cutting and splitting the wood, blowing the fire, &c. or in killing or skinning the Victims, and opening their entrails with his nails.’

Nor was this active zeal of his confined to some public Ceremonies only, wherein he might have imagined such a thing was expected from him. His Palace, in which he had builded a (k) Temple to the *Sun*, and an Altar apart for every other God, as well as his gardens, whereof every tree shaded an Altar, were the most frequent theatres of those religious scenes; and it is worth observing, that he had such an high opinion of the efficacy of those sacrifices he offer-

(i) Lib. in Jul. Imp. Conf. p. 245.

(k) Lib. de Vita Sua. p. 41. id. Epit. in Julian. p. 292.

ed himself, that he trusted no body else upon important occasions. There is a very notable instance of this. (l) An account was once brought him, that *Neptune* being angry with a certain City in *Thrace*, was going to overwhelm it, except he was soon appeas'd by proper expiatory Sacrifices. These, I suppose, could not be properly offered under a Roof; for *Julian*, (tho' it was so rainy and stormy a Day that no body could stand out of doors) remained in his garden the whole day, exposed to the inclemency of the weather; till, by repeated expiations, he had brought the God to a better temper. As to publick Ceremonies, nothing was below his Dignity: and even his Philosophy could not get the better of his Superstition. One of his favourite Maxims was, that *Chastity is to Morals, what the Head is to the Body*; yet, when the honour of *Venus* and the office his Priesthood were concerned, he did not scruple, but even took pleasure in the company of *Prostitutes*. I woud not have credited a fact of that nature, had the Fathers been my only authorities for it; but I can scarcely disbelieve (m) *Ammianus Mar-*

(l) Liban. Epit. in Jul. ap. Fabric. B. G. p. 312.

(m) Am. Marcel. lib. xxii. cap. 14. *Culpabatur hinc opportune (ab Antiochenis) cum, ostentationis gratiâ, ve-*
bens,

Marcellinus, who confirms it sufficiently, tho' he does not use the Word *Prostitutes*.

5. *Julian* was as ready to undergo fatigues and monastic penances, as to perform the brightest functions of Priesthood, when he imagined he could thereby shew some regard for his Gods. (n) *There was no road so rough and so unpassable*, says *Libanius*, *but his willingness made him find easy, if it led to a Temple, or even to a place where a Temple had stood before*. Abstinence and fasting were also usual with him. As the Gods of the Heathen were a little whimsical, some had taken a fancy for, or a hatred to a certain kind of food; some had declared for or against another kind. *Pan*; *Mercury*; *Hecate*; *Isis*, and all the other Gods, could not be pleased by a Man's constantly feeding on the same victuals. *Julian* wanted to please them all: consequently he abstained sometimes from one kind, sometimes from another, (o) *serving the Gods by turns*; at other times, he abstained from all kinds, and that with pleasure: for (p) by *fasting* he often had the advantage of conversing with the Gods.

6. The

bens licenter pro Sacerdotibus Sacra, stipatus que mulierculis lætabatur.

(n) *Liban. Monod. in Jul. cædem. p. 255.*

(o) Ἄλλοτε ἄλλων θεῶν τιμῶν ὁδοῖ. *Liban. Epit. ap. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. vii. p. 309.*

(p) *Ibid.*

6. The last particular I shall take notice of, is not a single Fact, but a series of Actions that runs through the whole Reign of *Julian*; I mean his Behaviour to the Christians. Had he been a Deist or a Free-Thinker, no Religion, then known in the World, could have a better title to his favour than Christianity: for it must be allowed that the principles of the Gospel, on the important Articles of the Unity, Nature, and spiritual Worship of God, come vastly nearer to the principles of true Deism, than those either of Paganism or Judaism. Yet, of all Religions, Christianity was that he hated most. And why? The reason is obvious. Because it was that which kept at the greatest distance from heathenish Principles and (q) Worship. On the other hand, it was his interest to use the bulk of his subjects so, as not to set them against him. He, who knew the strength and other circumstances of all parties better than it is possible we should at present, had such a notion of what policy required from him with respect to Christians, that, (not being able to get rid of the dread he had of them, even after *Constantius's* death, when

(q) It appears by his Books against Christianity, that he considered the *Jews* as much nearer, on account of their Sacrifices and Ceremonies.

when they had no Pretender to set up in opposition to him) at first he durst not attack them openly; but had recourse to the same indirect methods, which have been since used in *England*, under the Reigns of *Charles the First's* Sons, against *Protestants* of several denominations. He kept up as many parties as possible among the Christians, and, by acting the part of a mock Mediator, took care to widen the Breach; (r) *that Dissentions being increased by licence, says Ammianus, he might have nothing to fear from the union of the Multitude.* Under such circumstances, what motive, but a firm and sincere persuasion of Paganism being a better Religion than Christianity, could have engaged that Prince to act the part he did? This is not the proper place for entering into the particulars of *Julian's* persecution, which is sufficiently attested by pagan Authors, who even (s) censure the *Excess* of it. A bare view of the general method he pursued to annoy Christianity, is fully sufficient to shew how sincere a *Heathen* he was. But it must be first observed, that the avowed, and only possible design

(r) Am. Marcel. xxii. 5. *Ut, dissensiones augente licentiâ, non timeret unanimantem postea plebem.*

(s) Eutrop. brev. H. Rom. *Nimius religionis christianæ insectator, perinde tamen ut cruore abstineret.*

design of that persecution was, to bring the *Christians* over to *Paganism*. Had *Julian* been a *Deist*, and pursued only a political scheme in persecuting the *Christians*; had his only aim been to please the *Heathen*; he must have followed the methods most approved by those he wanted to ingratiate himself with. Now these methods had always been the most bloody ones; and they were so still, as it plainly appeared by their behaviour in several places during *Julian's* reign. The Pagans, in general, wanted to punish, rather than to convince, the despisers of their Gods. But *Julian* was a kind of a mild persecutor. His Scheme was to enslave, rather than to force the *Christians*. Far from indulging the *Gentiles* in their bloody persecuting Temper, he severely reprimanded those who gratified it. As he would, by no means, have the name of shedding blood for the sake of Religion, he spared the life of the *Christians*, when he had no other pretence to take it from them, and chose to deprive them by degrees of every thing that makes life valuable to those whose Religion is not deeply implanted in their hearts. His scheme was, it seems, to bring them to this Confession, that *Christianity* was an ill-contrived Religion, and by no means fit for Mankind; for, whenever he laid any hardship on them, he had always

always at hand some Text from Scripture, with a forced construction on it, to shew, that he took nothing from *Christians*, but what their Religion required them to abstain from. He knew what impression the prospect of esteem and contempt is apt to make on Men's mind: and having observed what esteem *Christianity* had gained, and was likely to gain, by bloody Persecutions; he resolved to persecute the followers thereof, in such a manner, as should make them despicable. This scheme was the best laid, of all that had ever been thought of. Had *Christianity* been nothing but an human Contrivance, as he took it to be, it was not probable Men could bear any considerable time, for the sake of it, an insupportable load of shame and contempt, when the glory of Martyrdom, which he considered as a bait, would be out of the question. Now, what motive could ever have induced *Julian* to form such a profitable scheme in favour of *Idolatry*, and to execute it, maugre the very People who were to be gainers by it, but a sincere and unwearied zeal for the Religion he publicly professed?

Thus far I have followed *Julian* through every stage of life; I have considered him, in all the different lights it was possible to do; and after using all the methods in my power to come at the knowledge

ledge of his real Sentiments about Religion; I am thoroughly convinced he was what all the World hitherto took him to be; a sincere and most bigoted Heathen; a Heathen out of real, though ill-grounded Conviction. I must now answer the objections urged by Mr. *Thurzlaernleszki* in favour of his decision, that *Julian* was not so much a Heathen as a Freethinker or a Deist.

1. Objection. (1) *No body ever denied but Julian was a Philosopher; and consequently it is impossible he should have been superstitious in his heart.*

Answer. It should have been first proved that the *Pythagoreans*, and such of the *Platonicians* who, like *Julian*, had a great mixture of Pythagorism in their system, were not such superstitious People as every one, who has been any ways conversant in their writings, knows they were.

2. Objection. (u) *No body can say that Julian was out of his Senses. The Fathers should therefore have concluded he acted a theatrical part, when he professed such a shocking Superstition*

(r) *Philosophum fuisse Julianum nemo negat, ac proinde superstitiosum ex animo illum fuisse impossibile est. De Pseudo-martyria Patrum, &c. p. 8.*

(u) *Insaniisse hominem nemo dixerit; unde Patribus in promptu fuit colligere, alienam eum personam sustinuisse, cum iis superstitionibus sese addictum profiteretur quæ hominem sanum minime decent, ibid.*

Superstition as becomes none but a Mad-man.

Answer, 1. The Fathers and Gentile writers have passed the same judgment upon *Julian* in this point. 2. Some learned men before quoted have taken *Julian* for a *Mad-man* in point of Religion, and that is in particular the judgment passed upon him by (x) Mr. *Spanheim*. 3. There is no accounting for the inconsistencies of human understanding. The wisest man sometimes acts unwisely in some particular case, and a great man said that there is no man without some folly or other. 4. It would be difficult to prove that all the Pagans were either Hypocrites or Mad-men.

3. Objection. (y) Since *Julian*, by comparing all the accounts relating to that subject, appears to have been a real, not a nominal Philosopher, a man of great parts and genius,

(x) In his Pref. before *Julian's Works* he makes these Words *Dæmonum ad insaniam cultus* a part of his Character.

(y) Cum ex collatis omnibus quæ ad id spectant monumentis luce meridiana clarius appareat, non nomine solum sed re Philosophum fuisse *Julianum*, maximisque ingenii dotibus præditum; etiamsi præsens ipse testaretur Ethnicorum figmentis fidem se adhibere atque eorum religionem ex animo venerari, minime crederem. Quod enim per se impossibile est credi nequaquam debet, *ibid. p. 9.*

us, I woud never believe him tho' he shoud certify that he receives all the stories told by the Pagans, and reveres their Religion. For a thing impossible in it self ought never to be admitted.

Answer. A Man who had really read all the accounts here referred to might say that Julian was a man of Parts; that he had a profound Learning; an extensive Imagination; a wonderful readiness at speaking; a bright Eloquence; but he woud never give it to understand that that Prince had a right judgment or a sound understanding. It was quite the reverse; and whoever will be at the trouble of reading his performances shall undoubtedly find, that he knew as well how to speak, and as little how to think and argue, as any Man in the World. To say the contrary one must do as Cotta says, (2) *Non considerare sed quasi fortiri quid loquare.*

(2) Cic. de Nat. D. i. 35.

DISSERTATION IV.

Upon the principles of Religion which Julian imbibed from his first Education under Mardonius.

CHRISTIANITY has so much the advantage of Paganism, in point of reason and argument, that it is scarcely conceivable, how one can ever become a sincere Heathen, who has once been a Christian. Yet this must have been the case of *Julian*, if ever he was a Christian, as it is most generally believed he was till the year 351. But that difficulty may be easily solved; if the ambiguity of the word *Christian* be removed, and the first education of *Julian* duly attended to. For my part I am entirely of my Lord (a) *Shaftsbury*'s opinion: That *Julian* never was a Christian, as to his principles, tho' he was one outwardly; and the true source of his Apostacy seems to me to have been rightly assigned by *Baronius*, *Le Sueur*, and other learned men, who think, the principles of Paganism were

(a) *Shaftsbury*'s Characterist. T. iii. p. 89.

Early Paganism of Julian. 133

were instilled into him from his earliest years, by *Mardonius* his private Tutor.

It must be owned that System has some difficulties, yet none of them are such as cannot be easily removed: But on the other hand it is grounded upon very strong presumptions and direct proofs. The contrary opinion seems to be supported by two positive Evidences, which must be first weighed as carefully as possible; *Julian's* own authority, and his friend's *Libanius*.

Julian, in a letter written to the *Alexandrians*, purposely to dissuade them from Christianity, argues from his own example to persuade them to embrace Paganism, (b) “Ye can be in no danger of erring
“ from the right way, says he, if ye follow
“ the advice of one, who has himself gone
“ that way, (*i. e.* has been a Christian) till
“ he was twenty years of age, and by the
“ favour of the Gods, has now walked in
“ the other way for these twelve years.”

From this (c) Mr. *Tillemont* and most modern Historians, whom Father *la Bletterie* has followed, conclude, that he had no manner of inclination to Paganism before the time spoken of in that passage. But *Julian's* expressions are very general, and may as well, at least, be understood of a full determination to abandon Christianity, or eve

G

of

(b) *Jul. Epist. li. "Αρχὴς ἔτην ἔκαστος*

(c) *Hist. des. Emp. T. iv. p. 87.*

of an actual renunciation of it, as of the first dislike taken at that Religion. Considering the circumstances that Prince was in, it is not probable he took his final resolution as abruptly as he must have done, supposing he apostatized when he was of the age of twenty, that is to say, very little after his being let out of the Castle of *Macellum*, without having had any previous inclination for Idolatry. Whilst he was undecided, he must be looked on as being neither a Pagan nor a Christian. Yet he makes no difference, and divides his whole life between the two Religions; which shews that he did not aim at a scrupulous exactness. As he professed Christianity, and had been initiated to it by Baptism, he looked upon himself as a Christian, as long as he had not utterly abjured that Religion, or been initiated to those secret doctrines of Heathenish Superstition, which he afterwards grew so fond of, and which proved his strongest tie to Idolatry. Now it is not surprizing that his initiation should have been deferred, by his Gentile Directors, till he was twenty; since, besides his being, till then, confined in the Castle of *Macellum*, quite out of their reach; it was customary for them, at that time, to conceal their secret tenets, even from those who were thoroughly educated under them; till they had attained that age. Agreeably to that mysterious way of dealing *Eunapius* (d)

who

(d) Eunap. v. Æd. Μόλις εἰς ἑικοσὴν ἔτος ἐξέρχτο.

who had been from his Childhood a disciple of Chrysanthius, was scarcely thought fit to be entrusted with the truer doctrine, as he calls it, till he was twenty. It is true *Julian's* words may admit of another construction, as well as of that I chuse: But then it will be impossible to reconcile him either to himself, as shall hereafter appear, or to other Historical Monuments.

Libanius's authority is also urged, to prove that *Julian* was once a sincere Christian, and abhorred the Gods of the *Gentiles*: And it must be owned he expresses himself in such a manner as gives great colour to that opinion: But if the several places where he talks in that strain be well examined, it may perhaps be found more reasonable to lay no stress on them; as they are written in a Rhetorical, rather than an Historical way; and plainly contradict unexceptionable Testimonies. One of *Libanius's* most favourite topics in praising *Julian*, was that that Prince had shaken off the prejudices of Education. To enforce that encomium, he must have represented that Apostate, as having once been strongly prejudiced against that, which he afterwards grew so fond of; and, accordingly, he generally talks of his Change, as of a thorough one, not as of an outward Change only. Yet in some places, when he is not so much transported by his declamatory enthusiasm,

G 2

136 *Early Paganism of Julian.*

thusiasm, he gives us to understand that *Julian* had never been without some inclination to Paganism : From whence we may conclude, that whenever that Prince's affection to Christianity is spoken of, the zeal of the Overseers of his Education is mistaken for his. It is allowed that *Julian* never wanted people to assist him in the performance of Pagan Rites, since his final resolution to side with the *Gentiles* in point of Religion, or his twentieth year : But before that time, *Libanius* says he gave such tokens of his inclination that way, as *raised the hopes of all judicious Pagans.* (e) *Before you had any body to assist you in the sacred Ceremonies,* says he to *Julian* himself, *you shed tears and gave other tokens of your sorrow, at the sight of what was then neglected, profaned, and insulted; so as to signify that in time you would not overlook such indignities.* This the Rhetor assigns to the young Prince's being instructed in the *Science of things that have a real existence* μαθήσει τῶν ὄντων, a phrase he always employs to signify the Theory of Paganism ; and as he distinguishes that Science from Philosophy, whereby (f) *Julian's* Apostacy was thoroughly compleated, he can mean nothing else but the Poets and other Classics, which that Prince had read with *Mardonius*. This may be confirmed from

(e) *Lib. Pan. p. 175.* Πρὶν ἢ εὐχόμενον ἔχειν τοῖς ἱεροῖς.

(f) Τοὺς ὄντας ἐπέγνω, ἡγεμόνι φιλοσοφίᾳ χρησαμένος.

from what the same Author says in another place, where he declares that he speaks of *Julian's* Childhood. (g) *I shall not mention*, says he, *how he embraced in his heart, (or perceived in his Soul, εἰδέατο τῇ ψυχῇ) those things that contain the rudiments and foundation of Sacred Rites, at the time he was under the dread and inspection of his Preceptors.* Thus it appears that *Libanius* is not consistent with himself, in the accounts he gives of *Julian's* first inclination to Paganism; and therefore, as he had no personal acquaintance with that Prince, at the time we are upon; and never proposed to write with that exactness and accuracy that is required from an Historian, he is no further to be depended upon, in what relates to that Article, than as he agrees with other Writers. I suppose this is the reason why *Mr. Tillamont*, who in some places seems to rely entirely upon his evidence, is so undetermined about the Question we are examining; and after insisting that *Julian* was a sincere and zealous Christian till the year 351, concludes (b) that some *unchristian word* spoken before that Prince, when a Child, may very well have instilled in him, from his earliest years, that inclination to the Worship of

G 3

Dæmons,

(g) *Lib. Or. viii. p. 233.* Παιδαγωγῶν τε ἐγκυμένων
 καὶ διδασκάλων φοβούντων — τῶν ἱερῶν τὴν βίαν ἔχοντα.

(b) *H. des Emp. T. iv. p. 492.* Une mauvaise parole;

Dæmons, which afterwards proved the source of his Defection from Christianity.

However, we must not pass unobserved the confusion which the adopting of the vulgar System, upon the point now in hand, has introduced in Father *La Bletterie's* account of *Julian's* Apostacy. That Author had read too much concerning *Julian*, and knew him too well; to imagine that he could be suddenly brought off from a Religion he had seriously followed till he was of the age of twenty. No: This was not the temper of *Julian*. † *Obstinate adherence* to whatever he had once taken in his head, either to do, or to maintain as truth, is an original stroke of his Picture as drawn by a good Master, *Ammianus Marcellinus*. Therefore it was necessary that the Reader should be prepared to see *Julian* changing his Religion, by being made to observe the previous steps which prepared the way for his Apostacy, and gradual decay of his Faith. This has been wonderfully well executed by the Author of that Prince's Life, who shews you all the Arguments which some Pagan Philosopher or other made use of to seduce him. But when were these Arguments used? How long were they operating a thorough Change upon such an obstinate Mind as that of *Julian*? Here the confusion begins, and 'tis impossible for any body to find out a thread

† *Am. xxii. 14. nusquam a proposito declinabat.*

thread that can extricate him out of the Labyrinth wherein F. La Bletterie has embarrassed himself. By his, and all other accounts (except Mr. *Ducange's*) *Julian* was nineteen years and near five months old when *Gallus* was made *Cæsar*. *Julian* was not let out of *Macellum*, immediately upon his Brother's Promotion, but only after † the representations of those who had the care of his Education, which, considering the Court was at a considerable distance and beyond Sea, required some time. Then he got leave to go to *Constantinople*, and repaired thither to compleat his Studies. When arrived at *Constantinople*, he resorted to the Schools of that Capital long enough to distinguish himself in such a manner by his proficiency in all kind of Learning, that every body began to take notice of his merit, and the Emperor grew jealous of him; upon which he was commanded again to cross the Sea, and retire to *Nicomedia* or whatever other part of *Asia Minor* he thought proper. I think allowing eight months for all that is but a short time; yet, short as it is, it carries us from the 15th of *March* 351, that *Gallus* was made *Cæsar*, further than the 8th of *November* in the same year, when *Julian* entered in the twenty first year of his Age. Now let us hear what the Biographer says of *Julian's* defection from Christianity,

G 4

which

† See *Vie de Julien* p. 13, 15.

which he is forced, by his System, to place in the twentieth year of that Prince's life. " *Julian*, * says he, being IN ASIA at absolute liberty of conversing with learned Men of all sorts must have FREQUENTLY heard such Apologies artfully made and strengthened with all that Pagan incredulity objected against our Religion. Faith was INSENSIBLY extinguished in his heart. He was on the brink of the precipice : But the force of Education supported him TILL HE WAS OF THE AGE OF TWENTY." Let any attentive Reader judge what time he had before he was of *that age*, since his being at liberty in *Asia*, to hear so frequently those Apologists of Paganism, and to be *insensibly* led into their way of thinking!

That he had an inclination that way, before the year 351, must evidently appear, to any one who will consider his behaviour whilst in the Castle of *Macellum*, where he was confined from the fourteenth to the twentieth year of his age. He complains to the *Athenians*, that he was there (i) *deprived of all kind of useful instruction*; which, in his style, seems to imply that he had not the means of improving in what he calls in other places, (k) *the instructions or disciplines* of

* Ibid. p. 24.

(i) *Jul. ad S. P. & Ath.* p. 271. Ἀποκεκλεισμένοι τὰ πρὸς μὲν μαθήματος σπουδαίαν.

(k) See *Julian. ap. Cyril. lib. vii. p. 229.*

of the Gentiles, and which he looked upon as an introduction to the Pagan Religion. One might suspect from thence, that he had already shewn some inclination that way, which *Constantius* wanted to check, and *Eunapius*'s remark, that (l) *Inspectors were set over him, that he might be a firm Christian*, changes that suspicion almost into certainty. *Gregory Nazianzen*, who became acquainted with him a little after he was let out of *Macellum*, gives it for an undoubted fact, that (m) he was then a *Time-server*, and affected a certain zeal for Christianity, only to conceal his inclination to Idolatry. The same Author mentions two particulars which may throw some light on that part of the History of the Apostate's sentiments which we are now examining. The first which is attested by *Sozomen* and *Theodoret* as well as by *Gregory*, when divested of some miraculous circumstances, that may be looked on rather as the judgment of prejudiced Persons on the Fact, than the Fact itself; stands thus. (n) *Julian* and *Gallus* had joined to erect a Church, so as to have each of them his own part of the Building to carry

G 5

on;

(l) *V. Max.* p. 68. Παράφυλακαὶ ὅτι; ἐν χειρὶ τοῦ ἐβραίου.

(m) *Greg. Naz. Or.* iii. p. 59. Καὶ ἐν ἱεροῦ τοῦ καὶ ἡδὲ. It is plain *Gregory* understands this last word of a false Religion, tho' it generally means bad morals. Whoever will take the trouble to read the place, shall have no doubt about his meaning.

(n) *Ibid. Theod.* iii. 2. *Sozom.* V. 2.

on : But that part which had fallen to *Julian's* lot, could never be raised to any considerable height. The ground threw up the Foundations ; or the Walls when raised, fell of themselves. This may be easily accounted for by the badness of the materials, and the carelessness of the Undertaker, if we suppose that *Julian* cared very little whether the Building succeeded or not ; and had undertaken it only as a blind to those who were set as a watch upon him by the Emperor, who suspected the sincerity of his Religion. But it will be hard to account for the fact, without a Miracle, if that Prince be supposed to have been a sincere and zealous Christian ; and Miracles of that kind are seldom to be admitted, tho' most Christians, at *Julian's* time, were very apt to allow them. *Sozomen's* reflexion upon the event is very remarkable. It carries an insinuation as if, at the very time it happened, several Persons had considered it in the same light as we do, and ascribed to *Julian's* negligence, what the more credulous Multitude took afterwards for a Miracle. *Every body judged it was like a Prodigy, yet says he, some suspected from thence, that Julian's Religion was not sincere ; and that he feigned to be a Christian only out of fear, seeing it was not safe, openly to profess his own sentiments under such a Prince as Constantius. It is said his renouncing his Father's Religion was owing*

to some conversations with Diviners. The conclusion of this Passage insinuates that the young Prince's conversations with Diviners, were anterior to his confinement at *Macellum*, and, of consequence, to the fourteenth year of his age.

The second particular mentioned by *Gregory* is very remarkable, as it may be confirmed by *Libanius's* own Evidence. (o) As soon, says he, as the two Brothers began to read Philosophy, and to be instructed in the Art of speaking; *Julian*, tho' he durst not openly declare his sentiments, *could not keep to himself his Philosophical principles of Impiety*, (i. e. Idolatry) but, like a hidden fire that emits some sparks, without breaking out into a flame, or a hot well, which, running in subterraneous channels, without being able to find a free out-let, is known by the smoak it sends forth, and the dead noise it makes under ground, so he behaved in such a manner, as *discovered the secret of his sentiments, to those whose Impiety rather than their Prudence, made more acute and discerning than the rest.* He used indecently to espouse the cause of Paganism in his disputes with his Brother, (under pretence of arguing on the weakest side of the question, but in reality to exercise himself against the truth) *He likewise took great delight in all those things which evince an inclination to Idolatry.*

This

o) *Greg. ubi sup. p. 61.* 'Εν ἑαυτῷ μόνῳ φιλοσοφεῖν.

144 *Early Paganism of Julian.*

This agrees wonderfully well with the account given by *Libanius*, tho' that Orator seems to have confounded the dates, and to have considered that as done when *Julian* was in a manner his own Master, which really belongs to the time of his confinement. 1st. He ascribes to Rhetoric the honour of (p) *having inspired Julian with the first inclination to worship the Gods.* 2dly. He considers Philosophy as having completed the work of that Prince's conversion, even *before he had any body to assist him in the performance of Sacred Rites*; which shews that he had no exact knowledge of the dates of the events he was mentioning. 3dly. He avers that at a time when not having as yet got that assistance, *he was already distinguished by his eloquence and his proficiency in the discipline of those things which have areal existence*, he behaved in such a manner as let those who approached his person plainly see that he would, as soon as opportunity should offer, come to the relief of dejected *Idolatry*. Now, all these circumstances do plainly fix the fact spoken of to the time of *Julian's* being at *Macellum*. It was there he was at first taught both Rhetoric

(p) *Lib. Pan. p. 173, 175.* τὸ αὐτὸν ἐκινῆσθαι τῶν λόγων. See also *Orat. in Jul. imp. cos. p. 234*, where *Libanius* says that *Julian* had noo sooner taken a taste of Philosophy, *παρὰ τὸ λαντα*, but he could no longer bear the Christian Doctrine.

toric and Philosophy. It was there, and no where else, after his being released out of that confinement, that he was destitute of assistance as to the Rites and Ceremonies of Paganism. We can't therefore but conclude, that *Julian* whilst at *Macellum*, and consequently long before he was twenty years of age, was very far from being an enemy to the Gods of the Gentiles.

His inclination to Paganism had not taken its rise in that Castle. Before he went thither, *Marcellinus* says positively, that he was a Heathen in his heart. (q) *From the first instructions he had received in his Childhood he was inclined to the worship of the Gods, and became more eager for it as he grew towards Manhood.* Tho' this Historian was the only Person that attested this, he would still deserve a great regard, as he is generally very exact, and seems, in this case, to have been particularly careful to distinguish the several ages, and the proportionable progress of *Julian's* passion, (if I may so call it) for Idolatry. How much more is he to be credited, when his Testimony is confirmed by *Julian* himself? That Prince, in his discourse upon the Sun, relates several things that had passed when he was but a Child, and which he gives for as many (r) *undoubted proofs* of his early inclination to be in a particular manner

(q) *Amm.* xxii. 5. A rudimentis pueritiæ primis.

(r) *Julian. Orat.* iv. Πῶς ἀπὸ παιδείας.

146 *Early Paganism of Julian.*

ner *Servant* to that Deity. In one of his discourses upon the *Cynic* Sect, he gives a very long allegorical account of the manner in which he had been brought off from Christianity, to that zeal for the service of the Gods, which he was so remarkable for during the whole course of his Reign: and, by that account it appears, (s) that he was but a *Child*, παιδίον, when the *Sun* and *Minerva* were intrusted with his Education by *Jupiter*; and a *youth* νεανίας, whose chin was just beginning to have beard, πρῶτον ὑπηνήτης, when he and all the Gods entered into mutual engagements to be true to one another. In his books against the Christians, he gives it to understand, that his first dislike to their Religion was owing to the *Disciplines of the Greek or Gentiles*, which Christians themselves took great care to have their Children instructed in: At least there can be very little doubt but he modestly meant himself, as well as others, when talking of those Sciences, he said, that (t) *by them all whom nature had favoured with any Parts, had been persuaded to renounce Christianity*. Thus it is plain, by *Julian's* own evidence; that his dislike of our Religion, and inclination to Paganism were of a much earlier date, than what he seems to assign in his Epistle to the *Alexandrians*.

Nothing

(s) *Orat.* vii. p. 227—234.

[(t) *Cyrisl.* vii. 229. Πᾶν ὅτι περ ἢ φύσις ἡμεῖς γενναῖον.

Nothing remains now, but to find out the true source of it. All Authors who have inquired into the matter agree, that he became prejudiced in favour of Idolatry, by the means of an interview with a (u) Magician or Diviner, who threw in his way a Prediction wherewith his ambition was pleased. It is also agreed that this interview happened at *Nicomedia*. But the authority of *Libanius* seems to have misled several modern Critics, who have misplaced the time of it. That Orator pretends it happened after *Julian's* return from *Constantinople*, which one can scarcely place before the year 352. But this is very improbable, considering the account that Prince gives of the date of his Apostacy. If he renounced Christianity when he was of the age of twenty, he must have done it and have been fully determined in favour of Paganism, before his return from *Constantinople*, since, * as we have seen before, he must have entered upon his twenty-first year before he left that Capital. At that time he had no more occasion for a Soothsayer to allure him into Heathenism. He had no more, if ever he had any, hatred to the Gods of the Gentiles, and the † beginning of the greatest good fortune that could befall Mankind, as *Libanius* calls it, can never be brought so late, without a gross Anachronism.

(u) *Lib. Pan.* p. 175. *Vie de Julien.* p. 26:

• P. 139. † Ἀρχὴ τῶν μεγίστων ἀγαθῶν.

148 *Early Paganism of Julian.*

Anachronism. *Libanius* seems to have confounded the times. *Julian* had told him something of his conversation with the Magician at *Nicomedia*, and of the effects of it. He knew the Apostate had been in that Town, after being sent back from *Constantinople*: He examined no further, and joined the two events, without minding the difficulties that attended that junction. For my part, I think it much more probable, that the interview happened during *Julian's* first dwelling at *Nicomedia*, before he went to *Macellum*, when his Education was committed to the care of *Eusebius*, then Bishop of that Place. That age was a very proper one to prepossess his tender mind in favour of any thing that could give him a prospect of a bright fortune; and it is impossible to reconcile all the accounts of *Julian's* early inclination to Idolatry and Divination, given by *Gregory*, *Marcellinus*, *Sozomen*, *Julian* himself, and even *Libanius*, except we fix that event upon some part or other of that period of the Apostate's life.

This being made out, it can't be a very difficult matter to point out the Man who first poisoned the young Prince's mind with a strong taste for Idolatry. The concurrence of the two causes, that contributed to give him that taste, viz. his fondness of Divinatory Arts, and of the Literature of the Gentiles, leaves little room to doubt, but *Mar-*
donius

donius was really the person, who, partly by his instructions, and partly by underhand methods, when something was required wherein he durst not avowedly appear, seduced *Julian* from Christianity. That Eunuch was the young Prince's private Tutor, and as he constantly (*w*) waited on him, even after the year 351, it was not possible for *Julian* to visit, or be visited by a Diviner, without his being privy to it. Therefore that very circumstance, that *Julian* had an interview with a Magician, tho' it had been but at the time mentioned by *Libanius*, is a strong presumption that *Mardonius* was the manager of that Conference; but to decide nothing rashly, it is proper to inquire a little more narrowly into the principles of that Eunuch, who, by *Julian*'s own account, had the framing of his mind entirely in his power.

Baronius (*x*) affirms it as an undoubted fact, that *Mardonius* was a Pagan; and I find several Authors of note in the same opinion; as (*y*) *H. de Sponde*, *Le Sueur*, *Morery*, and even *Hofman*, tho' he is quoted by Mr. *William Reading*, as contradicting *Baronius*. This assertion of the Annalist has been censured,

(*w*) See *la Bletterie*, vie de *Julien*, p. 15.

(*x*) *Baron. Annal.* A. 337. N°. 57. A. 345. N°. 7. 8.

(*y*) *H. Spond.* Epit. Bar. *le Sueur*. H. E. *Morery* Dict. *Hofman*. Lex. in *Juliano & Mardonio*. G. *Reading* in Soc. iii.

150 Early Paganism of Julian.

red, by some as not being sufficiently supported; and by others as being certainly false. The most positive of all these Censors is Dr. Cave, who calls the opinion we are now embracing (z) *a great mistake in Baronius*: but his censure can have very little weight, when it appears, that the only proof he brings against the Cardinal, is grounded upon such an oversight, as one of his Learning could scarcely be suspected of. *Libanius*, says he, *puts the case past adventure, when he tells us, this Eunuch was an excellent Guardian of temperance and sobriety, but withal a bitter and open Enemy to the Gods.* But *Libanius* says no such thing of *Mardonius*, either in the place quoted, or any where else. He (a) carefully distinguishes that Eunuch from two other Preceptors under whom *Julian* was educated. *Mardonius* was an excellent Guardian of sobriety; another Tutor, viz. *Nicocles*, (who, from what *Libanius* says in (b) another

(z) *Introd. to his Lives of the F. 4th. Cent. p. 26.*

(a) *Lib. i. Or. x. p. 262, 263.* Ευνυχός τε βέλτιστος σωφροσύνης φίλας, καὶ παιδαγωγός ἕτερος οὐκ ἀμείριος παιδείας. . . . σοφιστὴς γὰρ τις πονηρὸς τοῦ κακῶς ἀγορεύειν ταύτης θεοδότης ἔσχε τὸν νέον.

(b) *Lib. Leg. ad Jul. p. 157.* *Libanius* calls him *Priest of Justice* ἱερεὺς δικαιοσύνης, which the *Latin* translator seems to have understood, as if *Nicocles* was a *Lawyer*. The *Greek* Orator adds that probably *Julian* knew that *Nicocles*, who had been one of his Tutors, only in the capacity of a *Grammarian*, was, at the time this discourse was spoken, a *Philosopher* also.

ther place seems to have turned Pagan in *Julian's* time) was a *Man of Learning*; and he who was chosen for *Julian's* master in Rhetorics, viz. *Ecebolus*, was a bad Sophist, who had no merit but his defaming the Gods. Thus *Libanius's* evidence is to no purpose, to decide the question.

Baronius's proof is taken from what is said in the *Misopogon*; and it must be owned that *Julian* does not say there directly and positively, that *Mardonius* was a Pagan. But, on the other hand, if the whole passage be duly considered, and compared with the account *Julian* gives of his Education in another place; there can remain very little doubt of that Eunuch's being, at least, well affected to Idolatry, or a Heathen in his heart. "I shall give you," says (c) *Julian* to the *Antiochenes* whom he rails at, on account of the hatred they bore him, "a more proper object of hatred than I can be, viz. that odious Tutor, who, by his teaching me that there is but one path leading to happiness was the occasion of my sorrow when I was a Child, and is now the true cause

also. Ἐπίσταται δὲ νῦν (ὡς εἰπὼς) φιλοσοφοῦντα. This last word, in *Libanius's* style seems to imply that *Nirocles* was recently become a Pagan, and perhaps it was thrown in only to remind *Julian* of a Man, who appears to have been *Libanius's* friend by the Encomiums he bestows on him, and had a particular title to the Apostate's favour, as a Proselyte of Paganism.

(c) *Jul. Misop. p. 351.*

152 *Early Paganism of Julian.*

“ cause of my falling out with you ; for he
 “ has implanted, and in a manner imprinted
 “ in my soul, what I did not like at that
 “ time.” Then after giving an account of
 the precepts of strict morality which *Mardonius*
 taught him ; of his lessons upon the
 necessity of curbing one’s passions ; and of
 his opinion that the reading of *Homer* is suf-
 ficient to indemnify any body for the loss of
 all other diversions in the world, he con-
 tinues thus. “ He was an Eunuch brought
 “ up under my Grandfather to be my Mo-
 “ ther’s Guide thro’ the Poems of *Homer*
 “ and *Hesiod* You know the names,
 “ so often ridiculed in your Comedies, of
 “ *Plato, Socrates, Aristotle, Theophrastus.*
 “ That good old Man was silly enough to
 “ believe those Guides ; and finding me
 “ foolishly fond of learning, as I was young, he
 “ persuaded me that if I woud become their
 “ Disciple, IN EVERY THING, I shoud
 “ grow better, not than the rest of Mankind,
 “ (for I had no occasion to dispute with
 “ other men) but than myself. Now I have
 “ been persuaded, it is not in my power to
 “ change.”

The first thing to be observed in this
 passage is, that, tho’ *Anicius Julianus Juli-*
an’s Grandfather had been a Christian, at
 the time he designed *Mardonius* for a pri-
 vate Tutor, to explain *Homer* and *Hesiod*
 unto *Basilina Julian’s* Mother ; it must be
 owned

owned Christianity was not a necessary qualification for that employment : But if he was a Pagan, it is probable he chose rather one who had some regard for the Gods celebrated by *Homer* and *Hesiod*, to explain those Poets to his Daughter, than one who might teach her to laugh at those ridiculous Deities. Now (d) Mr. *Fleury*, and Mr. *Ducange*, who has so accurately inquired into the History of the *Byzantine* families, say positively, that *Basilina's* family was a *Heathen* one. It is true *Basilina* was once a Christian, as it appears by (e) her liberality to the *Ephebian* Church, mentioned in the Life of *St. Chrysostom*, and by the share *Athanasius* says she took in the Church affairs at that time : But she might have been brought up a Pagan, and have become a Christian afterwards, as many others did during *Constantine's* reign.

However it is certain that *Mardonius*, by *Julian's* account, had such a vast veneration for *Homer*, that (f) it is not improbable he scrupled differing from him, even in point of Religion, or at least was like those learned Men * whom *F. la Bletterie* mentions, and who, tho' professed Christians would not have been sorry to see the Gods of *Homer* and

(d) *Fleury* H. E. T. iii. p. 263. *Ducange* Fam. Byz. p. 49. (e) *Pallad.* V. *Chryf.* cap. 13. *Ath. Hist.* Ar. T. i. p. 347. (f) *Misop.* p. 351.

* *Vie de Julien.* p. 19.

154 *Early Paganism of Julian.*

and *Virgil*, restored to the rank they had in the time of Paganism. *Julian* tells us also that he had retained from the Education that Tutor had given him, those habits which made him hateful to the *Antiochenes*, and could never disuse himself from what he had learned from him. Is not this a broad insinuation, that he had received from that Eunuch those impressions in favour of Paganism, which contributed as much as any thing else to make him odious to the People of *Antioch*? What he says that *Mardonius* persuaded him to follow *Plato*, *Socrates*, *Aristotle*, *Theophrastus*, in every thing, in order to grow better, than himself, is still more positive; for whoever has read *Julian's* works, can never doubt, but that a thorough imitation of *Plato* (g) implies the practise of Idolatry; and therefore I may safely conclude, that *Julian* there represents *Mardonius* as having instilled into him the Principles of Paganism; which exactly agrees with the expression made use of by *Marcellinus*; viz. that *Julian's* inclination to the service of the Gods, came from the first Rudiments, or the

(g) *Julian* in his books against the Christians recommends *Plato* as much preferable to *Moses*, for that very reason, that he worshipped the Idols, ap. *Cyril*. lib. ii. p. 49. It shall appear, says he, which of the two is the best and the worthiest of God, *Plato* who adored the Idols, or *Moses* of whom the Scripture says that he spoke with God face to face.

the first Instructions he had received when a Child, *a rudimentis pueritiæ primis*,

That proof may receive a great illustration from another passage, wherein that Prince speaks of his first Education, as well as in the place we have just examined, and which I shall transcribe entirely, that the reader may have an opportunity of comparing both together. After ridiculing the *Cynic Enomaus* for his utter ignorance of the true meaning of Mythology, *Julian* continues thus; * “ If you never heard of those
“ things before, I forgive it you; for indeed
“ you have not received a liberal Education
“ when a Child; and you had not such a
“ Preceptor as I was blessed with, who explained me the Poets, and was at the same
“ time a Philosopher; from whose hands
“ when I gave myself up to the study of
“ Philosophy, I fell into those of a man
“ whom I looked upon as the most excellent Philosopher of this age; and was by
“ him initiated. That Preceptor taught me
“ above all things to be virtuous, and to
“ consider the Gods as the Authors of every
“ thing that is good and right Here-
“ frained the natural boldness and mad arrogance which was in my temper, and
“ endeavoured to make me better (or more
“ temperate) than myself. For my part,
“ tho’ I was, as you know, a little vain of
“ the

* Or. vii. p. 235

156 *Early Paganism of Julian.*

“ the worldly goods I was possessed of, I
 “ brought myself to an entire submission,
 “ not only to the Preceptor himself,
 “ and his friends, but also to my young
 “ companions of studies : I diligently at-
 “ tended the lessons of such as I heard him
 “ praise, and read all the books he approved.
 “ Thus I have been instructed by two
 “ Guides, one a Philosopher, who gave me
 “ the first education; and the other an *
 “ ArchiPhilosopher, who introduced me in-
 “ to the Temple of Philosophy.” There
 can be no doubt of *Maximus*’s being the
 second Guide here mentioned, as it is certain
 it was by his means *Julian* was initiated
 τελεσθισόμενος to the most profound Mysteries
 of Heathenish Philosophy : But as the illus-
 trious Mr. *Spanheim* † supposes the first to
 be *Nicocles*, it is necessary to give our rea-
 sons for thinking that *Julian* speaks of *Mar-*
donius, and looking upon this place as pa-
 rallel to that quoted out of the *Misopogon*.
 1. It was the proper business of *Mardonius*
 to explain the Poets, as has been seen already.
 2. What *Julian* says here of his first Tutor,
 that he was a Philosopher as well as a Gram-
 marian, exactly agrees with what is said in
 the *Misopogon*, of *Mardonius*’ having been
 led by *Plato*, *Aristotle*, and other Philoso-
 phers, into the path which he advised his
 Pupil

* φιλοσοφίαται.

† *Præf.* in *Jul.* p. 10.

Pupil to follow. 3. There is no proof of *Nicocles* having been a Philosopher when *Julian* was a Child, whereas there is good reason to think he never applied to Philosophy but after his Pupil came to the Throne. *Libanius* quoted, p. 151. in the note, can scarcely be understood any other way. 4. Considering how much *Julian* values himself, in the *Misopogon*, upon the instructions he had received from *Mardonius*, whereas he does not say a single word of *Nicocles*, it would be very extraordinary that he should be entirely silent concerning that Tutor, in the account he gives of his Education, to the *Cynic* Philosopher. 5. *Julian* ascribes to *Mardonius*, in the *Misopogon*, what is here ascribed to the Tutor he speaks of; for notwithstanding the diversity of expressions it is impossible not to be sensible, that giving a Child instructions, which *he does not like*, and teaching him to *curb his passions*, means the same thing as *refraining the boldness and arrogance of his temper*. The expression making *one better than himself* which occurs in both places, is a strong confirmation of this remark, as well as the entire dependance *Julian* professes here he had upon the Tutor he speaks of, and the declaration he makes in the *Misopogon*, that it was not in his power to alter his mind about the points he had been instructed in by *Mardonius*. How-

158 *Early Paganism of Julian.*

ever it is plain from this passage, that the Person (whether his name was *Mardonius*, or *Nicocles* is not the most material point) who taught *Julian* the first principles of Mythology, and gave him the first insight into the meaning of the Poets. ὁ ἡγεμὼν τῆς προπαιδείας, gave him that Maxim as a key to all Fables told of the Gods, that *the Gods are the Authors of whatever is good and right*, and of consequence laid the foundation of that Prince's firm adherence to the Worship of those Gods.

Thus I think the difficulty raised about that event may be easily solved. *Julian* did not really abandon Christianity to embrace Paganism: He only threw off a mask he had wore for twenty years, and followed those prejudices, which had been artfully instilled in him by the private Overseer of his education; who accustomed him to admire the Religion as well as the Poetry and Genius of *Homer* and *Hesiod*. (b) He had been reckoned as *Cyril* says, and had reckoned himself among the Believers, as he had been admitted to holy Baptism; but like those whitened sepulchres that are spoken of in the Gospel he appeared beautiful outward, while he was within full of all uncleanness. (i) "The first instructions he had received, " since

(b) *Cyrl. Præf. p. 3.* Τοῖς κριθεῖσιν ἐναρπάζουσιν.

(i) *Sam. Basnag. Flottm. Annal. Politico. Eccles. T. ii. p. 864.*

“ since he was a Child, says a very able
“ Historian, had instilled in him an inclina-
“ tion for Idolatry, which he had concealed
“ by an unwarrantable dissimulation.”

DISSERTATION V.

*Upon the Law made, and Laws supposed
to have been made, by Julian; in or-
der to restrain the Christians, from
studying liberal Sciences.*

THE particulars of *Julian's* Persecution have been so fully collected by (a) M. de Tillemont, and the learned Godefroy, and so judiciously abstracted by (b) Fath. La Bletterie; that the Reader may easily have from thence a sufficient information of that Subject. This consideration made me lay aside the design I had at first, to inquire into the several methods pursued by that Prince, to annoy Christianity. I shall therefore content myself with a few observations upon Points which have not been sufficiently cleared up.

H 2

Julian's

(a) Mem. p. servir. à l'h. Eccl. T. vii. p. 322. & suiv. item p. 717. & suiv. Jacobi Gothofredi orat. Polit. p. 46 & seq.

(b) Vie de Jul. p. 161—189.

160 Julian's *Law concerning Schools.*

Julian's Principles were not as inconsistent with a persecuting spirit, as it is generally imagined they were. It is true he declares himself against persecution in several places of his works, and seems to be fully convinced that mistaken Men ought to be dealt with rather as sick or mad people than Criminals. But where are the Persecutors to be found who will not allow some such general principles? Yet they always have some fetch or other to bring back that very intolerance, which their first concessions seemed to have entirely excluded. This was also the case with *Julian*. When he considered mistaken Men as led into error thro' want of understanding or proper instruction, he called them (c) *Fools* ἀνοήτους, and granted they ought to be instructed and not punished. But he was not always willing to view them in that light; and unhappy were they whom he was pleased to consider as scorning truth. He still called the disposition of their mind a *Distemper*, and granted they ought to be used like sick people. But, in his opinion, as the distemper they laboured under was a kind of *madness* or *phrenzy*, Φρενιτιζοντας, it was proper to use violent medicines. (d) *It would be just*, says he, *to cure them like phrenetics against their will*. He held another principle, which, under a Heathenish Government,

(c) Ep. xlii. Καὶ γὰρ οἱ μὲν διδάσκουσιν, ἀλλ' οὐ καὶ κολλάουσιν ἡμᾶς.

(d) καὶ τοὺς δίκαιον ἦν, — τοῦτο; ἀνοήτους ἰσθῆναι.

vernment, could never fail of bringing Christians under the denomination of Criminals, and exposing them to the greatest severities, whenever he should think proper to treat them in a manner suitable to their supposed deserts. One may see what encomiums he bestows upon the Author of this Maxim ; (e) *Whoever makes it a question, or in any wise disputes whether there be Gods, must not receive an answer like a man, but chastisement like a beast.* If he did not constantly make use of that Maxim against the Christians, it was rather out of political zeal than principles of Toleration. He considered, that an avowed Persecution would be rather prejudicial than favourable to the increase of Paganism. It might, on one hand, make Hypocrites instead of Converts ; and could not on the other fail of increasing the number of real Christians, or admirers of that faith for which men chose rather to die in torments than even seemingly to depart from it. Therefore when he did not persecute we must look on him as a zealous promoter of the real interest of his Religion ; and when he did, as a man forced by his principles into measures contrary to the wiser schemes of his Politics. In both cases he was a Zealot : In the former a Zealot who considered Persecution *a posteriori*, and abstained from it on account of its dismal consequences ;

H 3

in

(e) Or. vii. p. 237. Οὐχ ἀποκρίσεις ἀλλ' ὡς τὰ θηρία κολάζεις.

162 Julian's Law concerning Schools.

in the latter a Zealot who considered Persecution *a priori* and practised it acting upon principles.

However there is a circumstance of that Persecution, about which the Learned do not agree; and which deserves to be particularly inquired into, as it has been the subject of the loudest complaints of some Christians. I mean the restraint which Christians were then laid under with respect to the studying of liberal Sciences. It is certain *Julian* forbid them to hold any Professorship of Eloquence and Grammar, and even of Physic; but several Learned Men among the Moderns are of opinion, and some of the Antients give room to think, that he also forbid the Christians, to resort to any of the public Schools, where such Sciences were taught.

Baronius (*f*) is the first, among the Moderns, who, after examining the question, determined it in the negative; upon the strength of several authorities, but chiefly of

(*f*) *Baron.* Annal. ad. A. 362. §. 285, & seq. *Rich. Montagu* Notæ in Nazianz. investiv. ad pag. 4. *A. Pagi* Crit. An. Baron. ad A. 362. §. 30. *Hermant* Vie de S. Basile liv. 2. c. 26. *M. de Tillemont* Notes sur la Persec. de Julien. Note iii. *La Bletterie* Vie de Julien. p. 163. *Dr. Hicks* Jovian. p. 148. *Hen. Vales.* Notæ ad excerpta ex Joan. Antioch. p. 119. *idem* in Am. Marcel. xxii. 10. *Jac Gothofr.* Orat. Polit. p. 62. *idem.* in legem 4. Tit. 3. lib. xiii. Cod. Theod. *Cave's* introd. to his lives of the Fathers of the fourth Century, p. 41.

Julian's Law concerning Schools. 163

of *Julian's* own Edict. He was severely censured for it by several Authors; amongst whom the chief seem to be the Learned Bishop *Richard Montagu*; (wrongly called *Robert* by *Hen. de Valois*) *Ant. Pagi*; Mr. *Hermant*; and Mr. *de Tillemont*, whose opinion is embraced by *Fath. La Bletterie*, and Dr. *Hicks*. These rely upon the evidence of some Fathers, whose authority did not hinder several able men from joining with *Baronius*. Among these are the famous *Hen. de Valois*; *James Godefreoy*; and Dr. *Cave*. From this transitory view of the Controversy, one may conclude, that the merits of the cause must be carefully inquired into, before deciding the question, there being such great men on both sides.

The proofs brought to prove, that *Julian* made a Law to forbid the Christians, not only to teach, but likewise to be taught, must be first considered. Bishop *Montagu* supposes that *Gregory Nazianzen* is positive; and, if he was, it would be scarce possible to disbelieve him. But *Pagi* and *Tillemont*, tho' on the same side of the question in the mean with the Bishop, after examining with more attention the passages quoted out of that Father's invectives to prove the fact; found themselves under a necessity of owning that, as he speaks rather like an Orator than an Historian, it is not easy to ascertain his true meaning. It is certain *Gregory* makes use of

H 4

very

264 Julian's Law concerning Schools.

very general expressions ; and which may easily admit of, but do not necessarily require the construction put on them by Bishop *Montagu*. One may easily see he aims at making *Julian's* Law, upon the subject in hand, appear in the most odious, and the most ridiculous light possible. To this end he considers the design, and that which he takes to be the natural tendency of the Law, rather than the real contents of it ; for, tho^a he says (*g*) *this was not only threatned to be done, but actually enacted*, it is plain from (*b*) the apostrophes, and the questions he puts to *Julian*, concerning the words which Christians shoud be henceforth allowed to utter or not ; that his declamation points at the effects which he supposes the Law woud naturally have, rather than at the Law itself. Yet he expresses himself in such a manner, as to affirm nothing, concerning it, but what might be truly said, supposing it forbad the Christians to teach only, and not to learn. (*i*) *They were excluded*, says he, *from* what he calls λόγος, a word of a very extensive signification, and to which I don't think it possible to find one that answers exactly in any modern language. Besides several other significations that word meant liberal Sciences, or Learning in general ;

(*g*) *Naz. Or. iii. p. 96. Τῶν ἡδὴ νομοθετημένων.*

(*b*) *P. 98. Ἐρήσομαι εἰ ἰπτεῖς ἡμᾶς τοῦ ἐλληνίζειν.*

(*i*) *P. 51. Λόγῳ ἀπύλατον, p. 96. λόγων ἀποσπέρησαι.*

Julian's Law concerning Schools. 165

ral ; it meant, more especially, Eloquence, or the Art of speaking : sometimes it was taken for the very act of uttering words. Now which of these meanings shall we affix to that word in *Julian's* Law, as supposed to be related by *Gregory* ; considering that Father argues (*k*) from the last ; as if *Julian* had intended that Christians should be deprived of the use of their tongue. Again what shall we understand Christians were excluded from, with regard to whatsoever it be, that is meant by the word λόγος ? Was it teaching ; learning, or practising ? *Gregory* (*l*) ridicules *Julian*, as if he had intended the last. Yet no body has ever dreamed, that a Law was made, to divest the Christians of what knowledge they had got ; or to hinder them from making use of that learning, either in their writings, or in their discourses ; or to reduce them to such a silence, as was imposed on the new beginner by the *Pythagorean* discipline. And why should we extend the prohibition to studying, rather than to practising ? The word (*m*) παιδείσις which *Gregory* makes use of in one place to express what the Christians had been directly excluded from by Law, (*n*) was always understood

(*k*) Naz. Or. iv. p. 126. τὰς γλώσσας ἡμῶν ἐμφράσσουσας.

(*l*) Or. iii. p. 98. Or. iv. p. 132.

(*m*) P. 126. Νόμος τῆς καὶ ἐξέλιξεν τὴν παιδείαν ἀποκλείσαντες.

(*n*) See *Jul. Pol. Onom.* lib. iv.

166 Julian's Law concerning Schools.

stood of the Office of instructing, and there is not a word in that Author, (if you except that one, whereby the Law seems to be confined to the Teachers) that implies any thing besides an undetermined prohibition concerning Sciences. But what kind of prohibition it was, we must learn from some other Authority. Bishop Montagu insists that *Julian*, according to *Gregory's* phrase, *forbad* the Christians to *ἀντιλέγειν*, that is to say, not as *Baronius* imagines, says he, *to teach the Disciplines or Sciences of the Greek, but to apply to them in any shape, and even to speak purely*. I own *Baronius* affixes an unheard of meaning to the word *ἀντιλέγειν*; but is not the meaning affixed to it, by the learned Bishop, as unprecedented? That word never signified either studying or teaching. *Pollux* reckons it among those, that are meant of a certain manner of speaking; viz. that which was the purest and mostly used at *Athens*. Did then *Julian* make a Law to forbid the Christians to speak purely? No; But I think I may safely venture to say, that both the Cardinal and the Bishop have mistaken the sense of *Gregory*; as it may often be the case of the most Learned. His words require to be thus translated; (o) *be who ordered that*, (viz. that Christians should not be Professors of Eloquence, for it seems the word

(o) *Naz. Or. iii. p. 51.* ὁ τοῦτο προτάξας, ἀντιλέγειν λόγους
μὲν ἐκώλυσε, τὸ δὲ ἀληθεύειν οὐκ ἔπαυσε.

Julian's Law concerning Schools. 167

αἵτοι must be thus understood in that place) hindered us from speaking purely, but he could not put an end to our speaking truly. The word *καταλύειν* does not signify to forbid: but, if we may depend upon Phavorinus and Pollux, to hinder, or, to put an obstacle to. Gregory's meaning is, that, by the interdiction of Christian Professors, Christians would have been deprived of the means of learning how to speak purely. But how could that follow, says B. Montagu; and how could Apollinaris have been forced to supply, by his own performances, the want of Pagan Authors, if the Christians had been allowed to read those Authors, in the public Schools, under the Gentile Professors? The answer need not be far fetched. Julian, who had reserved to himself the right of approving or rejecting all the Professors of Learning, throughout the Empire, had also given special directions, that such as desired to be maintained in their Professorships, should (p) declare, and persuade their Disciples, that Homer, Hesiod, Demosthenes, &c. had not professed an erroneous Religion, and that they had formerly unjustly accused them of doing so. Thus the Schools of Learning became Schools of Idolatry; and it is not surprizing that Christians should have looked upon themselves and their children, as excluded in fact from places where they were permitted to

(p) Ep. xlii. Διδάσκειν ἔργῳ, καὶ πείθειν τοὺς μαθητὰς.

168 *Julian's Law concerning Schools.*

to resort, but where at the same time they could not go, without hearing their Religion blasphemed; and exposing themselves to be teased with the continual repetition of all the Topics urged in favour of Paganism. That light, in which it seems all the Christians of that Age considered *Julian's Law*, was the reason of their so violently exclaiming against it; and they were in the right; for *Julian's* allowing them to resort to the public Schools, as I am persuaded he did, was rather a snare than a favour. One may even conjecture he had foreseen, that, in consequence of his Edict, and of the directions which accompanied it, the Christians would exclude themselves from the Schools, and of course be reduced to that state of barbarity, which *Gregory* so pathetically describes as intended for them by this Law. I have been pretty long upon *Gregory's* evidence, tho' he is in a manner given up, by most of the modern Followers of the notion he was formerly supposed to have delivered in his invectives; because I look upon his general and unguarded expressions, as the true source of that notion, and it gave me an opportunity of explaining the nature of the complaints occasioned by *Julian's Law*. The obscurity which his ambiguous way of speaking threw on this subject being now cleared up by the foregoing observations, the next witnesses that are brought against

Barcinius

Julian's Law concerning Schools. 169

Baronius will not take up as much of our time, though they speak much more to the purpose. They say positively that *Julian* forbade the Christians to resort to the Schools; and therefore the question with respect to them is not what they said, but whether they spoke truth.

Rufine, whose authority is urged by *Mr. de Tillemont*, as being a coteremporary Writer, is universally known for an Author very little to be depended upon. He was so careless and so credulous in gathering the materials for his History, that *Mr. de Valois* thinks he wrote, without materials at all, what his memory suggested to him; so that no stress can reasonably be laid upon his Evidence, whenever any other ancient Monument is brought to contradict it. *S. Austin* deserves more regard; but it is not to be supposed he was always exact, even when he spoke of things which he was but slightly acquainted with. Now that he knew very little of the particulars of *Julian's* Persecution; appears from the very manner in which he speaks of it. He wanted to shew that the number of Persecutions, which the Church of Christ has to suffer, is not to be confined to ten. To prove it he says, (q)

* See *Cave's Hist. Litteraria. Vales. de vita & script. Socrat. & Sozom.* Memoriter mihi videtur composuisse. q) *De C. D. xviii. 52.* Qui Christianos Liberales Litteras docere ac discere vetuit?

170 Julian's Law concerning Schools.

what shall they answer about Julian, whom they do not reckon among the ten? Did not he persecute the Church who forbid the Christians to teach and to learn liberal Sciences? Would a Man, who had been apprized of the numberless enormities committed against the Christians under Julian's Reign, have given that Law as the most glaring instance of that Prince's deserving the name of Persecutor? It is plain, as a single hint of something that had been done against the Christians under Julian, was sufficient for the argument he had in hand; he did not take the trouble to examine the matter; and contented himself with mentioning what he had heard said. But in another Book, where he gives an exact account he had from *Simplician*, he mentions (r) Julian's Law, as forbidding to teach only, and says not a word of learning. *S. Austin's* speaking of what he had seen, is not to be urged in this case; for what is the observation of a child of eight years old, about such a distinction as that which must be made in this subject, between a formal Law, and the indirect effect of a Law? Besides I don't know but that Father's own Education might be brought as an evidence, against what he says of the prohibition to learn. By the account (s) he gives

(r) *Confes.* viii. 5. *Lege data prohibiti sunt Christiani docere Litteraturam & Oratoriam.*

(s) See the whole 1. Book of his Confessions.

Julian's Law concerning Schools. 171

gives of himself, he had been admitted among the *Catechumenes*; yet he did not leave off going to School, and reading the Poets, and other Pagan Writers, during his Childhood; part of which coincides with the time the Law we are upon was in force.

An observation upon what I have said that S. *Austin* had heard it reported, that *Julian* had forbidden the Christians to learn as well as to teach, may throw some light upon the testimonies of *Theodoret*, *Socrates*, and *Sozomen*, which we are now going to examine. Therefore I shall make it in this Place. The generality of people are very apt to judge of a Law which they have never read, either by the visible effects it produces; or by what they hear of its tendency; rather than by the real contents of it. That method of judging must have been practised even more than at present, before the invention of printing, when there could be but a few copies of an Edict dispersed in the Public. Thus it was very natural for people, who had seen the Schools deserted by most Christians, as soon as *Julian's* Law had been published; and were told that that Law, (which was of too short a continuance to be thoroughly known) tended to deprive the Christians of all the means of learning liberal Sciences; to imagine that an express prohibition to that purpose was enacted

172 Julian's Law concerning Schools.

acted by it. That opinion having once prevailed, may have imposed even upon Historians ; and the safest way is to explain or amend what they say, according to the Text of the Law, if we are able to come at it.

We have the more reason to apply that observation to the three Continuator of *Eusebius*, as two of them, as least, have interwoven manifest mistakes with what they say of *Julian's* Edict, and the third, (†) if he intended the place quoted should remain a part of his Ecclesiastical History, seems to have taken what he mentions out of *Rufine*, a very justly suspected Authority. *Theodoret* says that *Julian* (u) forbade the Children of Christians to be taught Poetry, Rhetoric, and Philosophy. But this is manifestly false. Every body agrees that *Julian* ordered nothing concerning the Sciences themselves, but only concerning the Pagan Authors which were usually read and expounded in the Public Schools by the Professors of those Sciences. The performances of the two *Apollinaris*'s, are an undoubted proof that Christians

(†) The whole Chapter (*Socrat.* iii. 16) seems to have been a Dissertation at first intended to have place in *Socrates's* History, then laid aside by him, but thrown in by the Compilers and Transcribers. My reason for thinking so is that it begins as if it had some connection with what has been said immediately before, tho' it has none at all, and the 17th Chapter seems to be the sequel of the 15th. But this I give only for a conjecture.

(u) H. E. iii. 8. Ἀπὸ τῶν παιδῶν τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἀπαγορεύεται μεταλλεγάνειν λόγους.

Julian's Law concerning Schools. 173

Christians were allowed not only to learn, but even to teach Poetry and Rhetoric; provided they did not meddle with Pagan Authors. This shews that *Theodoret* had not an exact information about the point we are treating; and of consequence his authority is not much to be depended on. As for *Sozomen*, he has given such an account of *Julian's* Laws against the Christians, as shews that he had not made a very exact inquiry into the matter; for he confounds what was already enacted, with what was only designed to be done; and mentions an Edict directly contrary to those *Julian* really made to distress the Christians. That Emperor, says he, (w) *deprived the Christians of the right of Citizens, and excluded them from the City Councils, and Markets. He did not suffer their Children to be instructed in the Poets and other Authors of the Gentiles, nor even to frequent their Professors.* Other Authors (x) tell us that *Julian* intended, had he come back from his *Persian* expedition, to make such regulations as *Sozomen* mentions in the beginning of this passage, but it is most certain he never did. As to City Councils, (y) συλλογαι, we have several authentic monuments, either Laws, or *Julian's* Letters, whereby it appears

(w) H. E. v. 18. Ἰσπολιτείας ἐφθ'ναι καὶ συλλογῶν, &c.

(x) Naz. or. iii. p. 94.

(y) *Phavor.* Σύλλογος, ἡ ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς τύλης συναγῶν τῶν ἀνδράων, ἐπὶ τῷ ἐκλεύσασθαι.

174 *Julian's Law concerning Schools.*

appears that that Emperor, far from excluding the Christians from them, forced even the Clerks to come into those Councils, and recalled the Privileges whereby they claimed an exemption from that obligation.

Thus far I have gone thro' all the proofs that are brought in support of the opinion attacked by *Baronius* and *M. de Valois*, and I don't doubt but this part of my Dissertation may appear very extraordinary in the eyes of some of my Readers, who will think it strange, that I should take upon me to contradict so many positive Authorities on account of a bare possibility of the Witnesses being mistaken. But now I am going to examine the reasons alledged by the Followers of the contrary opinion, I hope that mistake shall appear to be not a bare possibility, but a matter of fact. Hitherto our only business was to shew that *Julian's* having forbidden the Christians to be instructed, as well as to teach, is not sufficiently proved: Now we must give our reasons for inclining rather to think he never did.

Baronius's chief argument is taken from one of *Julian's* Letters which is looked upon, by almost all the Learned, as the very Edict whereby Christian Professors were turned out of their Employments. Bishop *Montagu* is the only one, I find, who ever denied that Letter's being an Edict, and insisted it was only a Letter. So far I am of
his

Julian's *Law concerning Schools.* 175

his opinion ; but I can't agree with him in what he adds, that it was a *Letter* written by *Julian* to a friend. I take it to be a Letter sent by that Emperor to the Magistrates or Common Council of some Christian Town, (or may be a circular one) † together with the Edict preserved Lib. xiii. Tit. 3. L. 5. of the Theod. Code concerning the *Physicians and Professors* ; in order to explain that Law. Whoever will read it, shall find, 1st. That it is not directed to a single person, since *Julian* speaks in the plural number, 2dly, That the persons that Emperor addresses himself to were Christians, since he tells them (z) *they obey Matthew and Luke ; and abhor the Sacrifices ; and wishes they may be regenerated,* (according to their own Phrase) *to the Rites of Paganism.* Now as the Laws properly so called, were always directed to some Magistrate of the first Rank, and there were no Christians left in those high Stations under *Julian's* Reign ;

† This is not the only Letter of that kind mentioned in History. When *Maximine* sent to the several Governors of Provinces in his District, the Edict of Toleration publish'd by *Constantine* and *Licinius*, he accompanied it with Letters to let them know in what manner he would have that Edict put into execution. And *Galerius* in his Edict to the same purpose says that he will, by another Letter, let the Judges know how they are to behave themselves. See *Euseb. H. E.* viii. 17.

(z) Ep. xlii. . . . Ματθαῖον καὶ Λουκᾶν οἷς πιστεύοντες, &c.

176 Julian's Law concerning Schools.

I conclude this was not an Edict or a Law properly so called ; besides the contents of it are more like any thing else than a Law. It is nothing but a string of forced arguments to prove, that a Christian who makes it his Profession to explain *Homer, Hesiod, Demosthenes, Herodotus, Thucydides, Isocrates, Lyfias, &c.* and lives by it, must be a Cheat ; and consequently that he is not a Man fit to be entrusted with the Education of Youth. In *Julian's* way of thinking, this was a very proper Commentary upon a Law, that begins with these words ; *it is necessary that the Masters and Doctors of Learning should be above all things, eminent by their good morals,* and a very necessary one to be sent to Christian Corporations, which, being entrusted by that Law with the choice of Professors for their own Towns, might have missed the true design of the Edict, and named Christian Masters, contrary to the Emperor's intention. For it is acknowledged, that this Law was intended to lay all Christian Teachers aside. However ; whether this Letter be a meer Letter, or a Law, it is *Julian's*, and consequently it may give us a certain information of that Prince's Transactions. But tho' the prohibition to teach is mentioned in it, there is not a single word of a prohibition to learn. Far from it : *Julian* says positively that his Edict must not be construed as if he intend-

ed

Julian's Law concerning Schools. 177

ed to exclude young People from the Schools. This Law, says he, extends to all Professors without distinction; but no young Man who is willing to frequent the Schools, is to be excluded: (a) For it would be unreasonable to bar the right way against young Men, ignorant of the path they ought to chuse, or to constrain them by terror to follow the Religion of their Ancestors. Fath. La Bletterie pretends that the young Men here allowed to resort to public Schools, were such only as professed no Religion at all; for that reason, that *nothing is better attested in History than the prohibition* for Christians to study Letters. But the Ancients who speak of such a prohibition, were manifestly mistaken, for they say positively that it excluded from the Schools the Children of the Christians, and all such as would not profess and exercise Idolatry; tho' it is plain those Children are the very Persons against whom *Julian* declares it would be unreasonable to bar the way that leads to Learning, which he considers in other places as containing the first rudiments of Paganism. He represents them as ignorant (not uncertain as F. La Bletterie translates ἀγνοῦντας) of the path they ought to chuse, not to say that they professed no Religion at all; but to insinuate that as long as young people have not inquired

(a) Οὐδὲ γὰρ εὐλογον ἀγνοῦντας ἐπὶ τοῦ παιδας ἐφ' ὃ πῶς τρέπονται, τῆς βελτίστης ἀπολαΐειν ὁδοῦ, φέρει δὲ καὶ ἀνοήτως αἰεὶ ἐπὶ τὰ πάτρια.

178 Julian's *Law concerning Schools.*

inquired into the grounds of the Religion they either profess or reject, they are to be considered as knowing nothing of the matter. Had he looked on them as *uncertain*, and *seeking* for truth, he would never have called them *Phrenetics*, and talked of *curing them of their distemper, whether they would or not*, a metaphor he makes use of in several places of his works, to signify *bringing People from Christianity to Idolatry*.

Hermant, Tillemont and Pagi acknowledge that, by this Law, for they agree in taking *Julian's* 42d Letter for an Edict, Christians were allowed to be taught, tho' they were forbidden to teach; but, say they, why should not we admit of a second Edict to that purpose? And I say, why should we admit of such an Edict, that is not to be found; and of which there is no mention in any of the many Monuments of that Age, that have been preserved down to ours? Their answer is, first; that since the prohibition to learn is well attested, tho' it is not contained in the first Law, there must be a second one: Secondly, that since several things mentioned by the Ancients as contained in the Law whereby that prohibition was enacted, are not to be met with in the Law that remains; it is necessary to suppose there was another. Let us consider these two answers separately.

As to the first, it is a meer begging of the

Julian's *Law concerning Schools.* 179

the question; and we have seen that the evidence brought in to support the assertion is either mistaken, the Authors alledged having not spoken as positively as is pretended, or such as not to be depended on. We may add that no Author mentions two different Edicts. They all agree in mentioning but one, and, what is the most remarkable, *Gregory Nazianzen*, (who is understood by those from whom I differ on this point, as favouring their opinion, and who must have spoken of the prohibition to learn, if ever there was any) positively says, that the Edict he complains of was published (b) in the very beginning of *Julian's* Reign, and was his first care. There may be something hyperbolical in this; but at least it excludes a date later than that of the Law preserved to this day in the Code, whereto *Julian's* (c) Epistle xlii. manifestly refers; and which was made but a few days more than a year before *Julian's* death, in the seventh month of his Reign. The greatest affront offered to liberal Sciences, *ἀγίου*, according to *Gregory*, was done by an Edict published in the beginning of *Julian's* Reign.

(b) Or. iii. p. 52. 'Εν ἀρχῇ τῆς αὐτοῦ βασιλείας.

(c) This Epistle is the xliii. in the Edition of *Paris*, 1583, which I suppose, was the occasion of *R. Montaigne's* finding fault with *Baronius*, as if that Cardinal had confounded the Letter to *Jamblichus* (which in that Edition is the 42d, tho' every where else the 41st) with that we are speaking of.

178 Julian's *Law concerning Schools.*

inquired into the grounds of the Religion they either profess or reject, they are to be considered as knowing nothing of the matter. Had he looked on them as *uncertain*, and *seeking* for truth, he would never have called them *Phrenetics*, and talked of *curing them of their distemper, whether they would or not*, a metaphor he makes use of in several places of his works, to signify *bringing People from Christianity to Idolatry*.

Hermant, Tillemont and *Pagi* acknowledge that, by this Law, for they agree in taking *Julian's* 42d Letter for an Edict, Christians were allowed to be taught, tho' they were forbidden to teach; but, say they, why should not we admit of a second Edict to that purpose? And I say, why should we admit of such an Edict, that is not to be found; and of which there is no mention in any of the many Monuments of that Age, that have been preserved down to ours? Their answer is, first; that since the prohibition to learn is well attested, tho' it is not contained in the first Law, there must be a second one: Secondly, that since several things mentioned by the Ancients as contained in the Law whereby that prohibition was enacted, are not to be met with in the Law that remains; it is necessary to suppose there was another. Let us consider these two answers separately.

As to the first, it is a meer begging of
the

Julian's *Law concerning Schools.* 179

the question; and we have seen that the evidence brought in to support the assertion is either mistaken, the Authors alledged having not spoken as positively as is pretended, or such as not to be depended on. We may add that no Author mentions two different Edicts. They all agree in mentioning but one, and, what is the most remarkable, *Gregory Nazianzen*, (who is understood by those from whom I differ on this point, as favouring their opinion, and who must have spoken of the prohibition to learn, if ever there was any) positively says, that the Edict he complains of was published (b) *in the very beginning of Julian's Reign*, and was *his first care*. There may be something hyperbolical in this; but at least it excludes a date later than that of the Law preserved to this day in the Code, whereto *Julian's* (c) Epistle xlii. manifestly refers; and which was made but a few days more than a year before *Julian's* death, in the seventh month of his Reign. The greatest affront offered to liberal Sciences, λαγοι, according to *Gregory*, was done by an Edict published in the beginning of *Julian's* Reign.

(b) Or. iii. p. 52. Ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς αὐτοῦ βασιλείας.

(c) This Epistle is the xliii. in the Edition of *Paris*, 1583, which I suppose, was the occasion of *R. Montaigne's* finding fault with *Baronius*, as if that Cardinal had confounded the Letter to *Jamblichus* (which in that Edition is the 42d, tho' every where else the 41st) with that we are speaking of.

180 Julian's Law concerning Schools.

Reign. Have not we a good reason to conclude from thence, that an Edict whereby any offence is supposed to have been done to Learning, greater than the first, has no real being at all?

The second answer supposes a thing which cannot be proved, viz. that the places quoted out of some ancient Authors, are mentioned by them, as taken from Julian's Edict. A short review of those passages may convince us how groundless this Supposition is.

(d) *Among the arts from the exercise of which Julian excluded the Christians, says F. La Bletterie, S. Chrysoſtom mentions that of Phyſic, which proves that this Emperor extended his prohibitions to other things, beſides thoſe mentioned in the Law remaining.* But if both St. Chryſoſtom and the Law be well examined, this inſtance ſhall be found to no purpoſe. (e) The firſt did not propoſe to enumerate the Arts which Chriſtians had been excluded from, but the advantages of any kind which they had been deprived of. He mentions in particular Military Employments. But the word he makes uſe of is ſo general, that upon the ſtrength of it alone, one could not even conclude, that Chriſtians were excluded from being profeſſors of Phyſic.

(d) *Vie de Julien, p. 163.* (e) *Chryſoſt. Homil. in Juvent, &c. 1. V. Ed. Savil. p. 533.*
 Στρατιώτας—ἀφίσασθαι τῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων ἐκείνων.

Physic. Physicians enjoyed (f) so many Places and Employments, which may as well come under the denomination of *ἐκκλησιαστικά*, as any Military Dignity, that if there was no other proof of their having lost their Professorships, one might think S. Chrysostom meant an exclusion from those Places. As to the Edict it is expressed in such comprehensive words, that I don't see how one can suppose that the Physicians were not affected by it. Does not the Edict, properly so called, mention all *Masters or Teachers of Learning, and Doctors*? Were not the Physicians included under that double name, who, in the (g) first Law of the same Title, are reckoned among the *Professors of Learning*; and was not that very Law brought by the Compilers of the *Theodosian*, and of the *Justinian Code*, under the Title *de Medicis et Professoribus*? Does not the Letter, which is generally looked upon as an Edict to the same purpose, mention (h) *all who profess to teach any thing*? And will any one say, that teaching Physic is teaching nothing?

Gregory and Theodoret who are referred to, as quoting passages taken from Julian's Edict, mention those passages as from Julian,

(f) See Gothof. in paratitlon Lib. xiii. Cod. Theod. Tit. 3.

(g) Medicos, Grammaticos, & Professores, *ἅλλοις litterarum*.

(h) Πάντας τοὺς ἐπιδιδόντας ἐκταγμένους.

182 Julian's Law concerning Schools.

lian, it is true, but not as from his Edict; which it is very probable the latter had never seen. There is no reason why we should think that either the Jest or serious Arguments Julian made use of, to justify the restraints he laid the Christians under, or the motives he gave for so doing, were parts of his Edicts. The motive related by (i) Theodoret, can never be looked on as having been part of a Law, by any one who will take the trouble seriously to consider it. It is rather a confession of a secret motive, than a thing Julian would have chosen publicly to boast of. As for what (k) Gregory mentions that Julian equivocated upon the word *ἐλληνίζον*, and, from that word's double meaning, concluded that those who would not (*ἐλληνίζον* in one sense, that is to say) be of the Religion of the Greeks, ought not to (*ἐλληνίζου* in the other sense neither, that is to say) be partakers of the Sciences of the Greeks; it is probable he had taken it from that Emperor's Books against the Christians; and very likely from the place which preceded immediately those words preserved to us by Cyrill; (l) *Why should you take a taste of the Sciences of the Greeks, since the read-*

(i) H. E. iii. 8. viz. that the Pagans were beaten with their own weapons. (k) Naz. Or. iii. p. 51. 97.

(l) Cyril. adv. Jul. Lib. vii. p. 229. Τῷ χάριν ὅμως τῶν παρ' ἑλλήσι παρεσθίοντι μαθημάτων, ὥστερ' αὐτάρκτης ὑμῖν εἶναι, &c.

ing of your Scriptures is abundantly sufficient for you?

To Julian's Edict, or Letter, Baronius and Mr. Henry de Valois add several negative Testimonies, from Authors, who could scarcely avoid mentioning that Prince's Prohibition to be instructed, had there been any such one, and yet are silent on it. S. Ambrose, in a place where he wants to make Julian's Law appear in the most odious light, expresses himself in the following manner. (m) *They ask for Privileges, who, by a late Law of Julian, have denied us that which all Men have an equal right to, to speak and to teach.* Here it is plain that that Father knew nothing of a Prohibition to study, or else he would have mentioned it. But the word to speak say Hermant, Pagi, and Tillemont, may imply the study of Eloquence, which Julian chiefly envied to his Christian Subjects. It is true, the word in itself might be thus understood; but if you examine Ambrose's style, when he talks of Schools and public Auditories; you shall find that, by speaking, he means delivering those elaborate Discourses, which Professors used to pronounce in their Auditories. Thus, in a place where he manifestly alludes to the effects which followed from Julian's Law, and to the Jest of that Emperor, that it was

I 2

enough

(m) *Ambros. Ep. ad Valent. T. ii. p. 824. Loquendi communem usum Juliani lege—denegarunt.*

184 Julian's Law concerning Schools.

enough for Christians to believe; (n) "Now,
 " says he, let Dialectic be mute in its Col-
 " leges. I don't ask what the Philosophers
 " SPEAK, but what they do. They have
 " been left alone in their own Colleges. See
 " what advantage Faith has over Argu-
 " ments. These who dispute upon so many
 " things are daily deserted by those who
 " used to frequent their Schools; They
 " who plainly believe, increase every day."
 Besides, had the Law we are inquiring after
 been known to him, the study of Eloquence
 was not the only study he had occasion to
 mention; and consequently the word to
 speak, could in no manner have answered his
 purpose.

(o) S. Jerom; S. Austin, or rather Sim-
 plician, in the account he gives of *Victori-
 nus's* Conversion, and *Eunapius* have been
 quoted as negative evidences in this Contro-
 versy; but as it does not appear to me the
 design they proposed, in the places quoted,
 absolutely required they should mention the
 Prohibition to learn, tho' there had been
 one; I shall not insist on their silence. It
 may be a presumption; but it does not a-
 mount to a proof:

The
 (n) *Deside Lib. 1. cap. 13. N° 84. T. ii. p. 469.*
 Non quæro quid LOQUANTUR Philosophi.

(o) *Hier. Chron. Aug. Conf. viii. 5. Eunap. in*
Prolog.

Julian's Law concerning Schools. 185

The evidence of *Paulus Orosius*, and *Am-
 mianus Marcellinus* is much stronger, because
 they both intended to give an account of the
 Law or Laws whereby *Julian* had put any
 restraint on the Studies of the Christians.
 (p) *Julian*, says the former, chose to make
 use of Art and Finesse rather than to employ
 his Authority to molest the Christians
 yet he openly made a Law to forbid all Christi-
 ans to be Professors of liberal Arts. M. de
Tillemont owns that this Author knew no-
 thing of the Prohibition to learn. But if *O-
 rosius* knew nothing of it in the beginning
 of the fifth Century, it is very probable
 there was no such thing. *Marcellinus*, a co-
 temporary Historian, who can never be
 suspected of having been ignorant of the
 Laws made by *Julian* on this point, agrees
 with *Orosius*. He speaks of this subject in
 two different places, and, tho' he censures
Julian in both, he mentions but that Law
 which is the milder of the two, supposing
 there were really two; which makes the
 thing at least improbable. (q) Among other
 I 3 Laws,

(p) *P. Oros.* Hist. vii. 30. Bib. Pat. T. vi. p. 442.

(q) *Am. Marcel.* xxii. 10. Illud autem erat incle-
 mens, obruendum perenni silentio, quod arcebat do-
 cere Magistros Rhetoricos & Grammaticos ritus Chri-
 stiani Cultores. *ibid.* xxv. 4. inter quæ erat illud incle-
 mens, quod docere vetuit Magistros Rhetoricos &
 Grammaticos Christianos, ni transissent ad Numinum
 Cultum.

186 Julian's Law concerning Schools.

Laws, says he, *Julian made a cruel one, and which deserves to be for ever buried in silence, to binder the Christian Masters of Rhetoric and Grammar from teaching, except they turned Adorers of the Gods.* Montagu, Tillemont, and F. La Bletterie, pretend that *Marcellinus* must, or at least may, be understood, as if he said that the Masters were forbidden to instruct any Christians; but I leave it to the judgment of whoever understands *Latin*, whether his phrase may admit of that construction. At least it must be owned it is a very forced one, and consequently it is not to be received without some very pressing reason, or some instance of that Author's expressing himself in such an unprecedented manner. At least, says *Tillemont*, that construction is more agreeable to the severe censure passed by *Marcellinus* upon the Law he speaks of; for what great hardship woud that have been upon the Christians, if they had been forbidden to teach only, and allowed to be taught. But that learned Man does not consider that it was a great hardship upon the Professors to have a settled maintenance and lawful right taken from them, and to be barred from the only way they had of earning their bread. Had they been only turned out of their Employments, and allowed to open private Schools, they might have still been able to support themselves and their Families.

Julian's *Law concerning Schools.* 187

lies. But by *Julian's* Edict they must either starve, or turn to some Employment they were utterly strangers to. It was also a great hardship upon all Christian Parents, to have no School left, where they might send their Children, but such where they knew that all endeavours would be used to seduce them.

Before I conclude this Dissertation, I beg leave to add another negative authority to those urged by the great Men whose steps I have hitherto followed ; and whose arguments I have enforced and vindicated. It is a known thing that *Julian's* Edict against the Christian Professors was abrogated by a Law of *Valentinian* preserved in the *Code*. But if the Apostate's Regulation extended to the Auditors, how comes it that, in the repealing Law, there is not a word of them. The Professors are required, (r) *either to open a new Auditory, or to open again that which they had been forced to leave off*, but what signified their opening Schools if the Christian Youth was still forbidden to frequent them? Now to conclude, as the Authorities which have given rise to the opinion that *Julian* had forbidden the Christians to be instructed in the liberal Sciences, are not sufficient to prove it ; the silence of those who must unavoidably have mentioned that Regulation, if it had been known at their time, concurring with the Testimo-

I 4

ny

(r) *Cod. Theod. Lib. xiii. tit. 3. Lex. 6.*

188 Julian's Law concerning Schools.

ny of *Julian* himself, who declares that a Law to that purpose would be contrary to reason and common sense, must, it seems, decide the question. For my part I think it probable that *Julian* never mentioned the words *Christian Professors* in any Law, properly so called; but contented himself with signifying by Letters, his intention, that Christians should be involved in the description of the Law he had made to exclude from that Office such as he did not think proper to entrust with it; and this I take to be the reason why the Christians are not named in *Valentinian's* Law, which is allowed to have been made in their favour. This is much more agreeable to that Emperor's usual way of dealing with Christians, (whom he avoided, chiefly in the beginning of his Reign, to persecute by open Laws,) than what is generally supposed. To have made a Law, which seemingly looked another way, tho' it was really intended against them, and against them alone, is so much like *Julian*, that I can scarcely believe he acted in any other manner.

† *Si quid inexpertum*

Servetur ad imum

Qualis ab incepto processerit, et Sibi constet.

D i s-

† Horat. Ars. Poet.

DISSERTATION VI.

On the particular favour shewn by Julian to some Heresiarchs.]

JULIAN was such a bitter enemy to the name of Christ, that one cannot but be amazed at the particular favour he shewed to some who professed Christianity. This makes me imagine that Dupin did not express himself exactly, when he said that Julian took (a) *no side in the disputes of Religion that were among the Christians*; and when I consider who were the Men whom Julian distinguished from the rest of the Christians, by bestowing his favours on them, I am surprized at Fath. La Bletterie's saying of that Prince, that he took a special delight (b) *in vexing the Arians, whom he hated even more than any other Sect among the Christians*. None of the three Authorities referred to, in the Biographer's Margin, can warrant that assertion, and it is very easy to prove, from Julian's own Writings, that he knew enough of Christianity, to look on those who stood up for the Eternal Divinity of our Saviour, as the most genuine Followers

(a) E. H. of the 4th Cent. p. 31.

(b) Vie de Julien, p. 247.

190 Julian's favour to Aëtius, &c.

Followers of the Doctrine of the Gospel, and consequently to hate them more than any other Christians. The Edict whereby the Bishops that had been banished by *Constantius* were recalled from their exile, was a favour granted to those among the Arians, who were the greatest enemies to the Divinity of Christ, as well as to the Consubstantialists; and it was clogged with clauses from which that Prince took a handle to disturb the latter, tho' not the former; when, taking advantage of the Edict, they returned to their Sees. We don't find that any Orthodox was ever admitted into *Julian's* confidence; or received any favour from him: He thought that he did a great deal for them, when he forbore doing them such injustice as could admit of no palliative. But *Aëtius*, the Author of the Anomæan branch of Arianism; *George*, the Arian Bishop of *Alexandria*; and *Photinus*, the inventor of a new System to defraud our Saviour of the honour and worship due unto him; were among the Apostate's intimate friends, and received special marks of his favour. *George* had been acquainted with him, before he was raised to the dignity of *Cæsar*, and so intimately, that *Julian* (c) knew almost all the books of his Library, which was very numerous. We know no particulars of their intimacy being renewed after *Julian* came to the

(c) Jul. Ep. ix. Ἐτίσταναι δὲ ὅτι τὰ βιβλία βλάστα.

the Throne; but, as he is the only Christian for whose murder a Pagan Community was ever checked by that Prince, it is probable he was still his friend; and more so, as the Emperor took no notice of the death of two public Officers who had fallen a Sacrifice to the fury of the Populace in the same Sedition which put an end to *George's*, Life. We know likewise very little of what passed between *Julian* and *Photinus*; yet enough to be certain that the Apostate took part in the dispute that *Heresiarch* had occasioned among the Christians; for (d) he wrote him a Letter wherein he declares himself for that side of the question which *Photinus* had espoused against *Diodorus Tarsensis*, a stout Defender of our Saviour's Divinity. But no Christian, that we know of, was ever as much cherished by *Julian*, as *Aëtius*. He had been such an intimate friend of his, when a private Man, that he thought proper when Emperor, to favour him with a (e) very obliging Letter, and to invite him to his Court; as he did most of the Pagan Philosophers he had been acquainted with in *Asha*. A special distinction was added to the invitation, for *Aëtius* was allowed a public Chariot for his Journey. Yet *Julian's* kindness to him did not rest there. He (f) made him a present of an Estate in the Island of *Lesbos*,

(d) Ap. *Facund. Hermian. Deff. 3. Cap. iv. 2. p. 59.*

(e) *Jul. Ep. xxxi.*

(f) *Philost. ix, 4. Τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν διαθήσεως σύμβολον.*

193 Julian's favour to Aëtius, &c.

Lesbos, as a token of his benevolence, and, if our conjecture be right, got him ordained a Bishop. At least it is certain *Aëtius* was not in the Episcopal Order before *Julian's* Reign. (g) He was promoted to it only during his and *Eunomius's* stay at *Constantinople*, after his return from banishment; and the Emperor's letter to him, which must have been anterior to that return, is the first monument wherein he is styled a Bishop. However, it appears that his Sect got more strength, and took bolder steps under the Apostate's short Reign, than it had done before, or ever did afterwards; which gives room to suspect that * favour was shewn it as well as to the Hæresiarch.

Now

(g) See *Philost.* vii. 6. & M. de Valois's Note.

* One might infer from these words, *the unsufferable Persecution against the Christians put an end to that design* (τὴν διώκην πρὸς ἐκκοίαν) coming immediately after the account given by *Philost.* VII. 6. of certain transactions in favour of *Aëtius*, and of his Followers's intention to communicate those transactions with *Eudoxius's* Clergy, that the *Anomæans* or *Aëtius's* friends bore a share in that Persecution: But it must be observed that these are not the words of the Historian, who would never have called that design *ἐπίλ.* by a name that carries a censure on the whole transaction. They are a conjecture of *Photius*, who finding no further account of an affair which it seems *Philostorgius* had very minutely related, supposes it was put an end to by an event which had an almost universal influence on the affairs of Christians at that time. It may be also that the *Constantinopolitan* (or *Eudoxius's*) Clergy,

Now what cause can that astonishing Favour shewn to three Christians, and especially to Aëtius, be ascribed to? I am much mistaken if Libanius does not point out the true one, in a place where he treats of the grounds of Julian's friendship and hatred. That pious Prince, says he (b) was more intimate with those who had imbibed the doctrine of Heathenism than with his very Relations. The friend of Jupiter was his friend, and Jupiter's enemy was his also; or rather he was a friend to every friend of Jupiter; but not an enemy to every one who was not as yet a friend to that God; for he did not immediately drive away such as he thought might in time alter their way of thinking. I won't say that either Photinus, George, or Aëtius had ever given him any hopes of turning Heathen; but I think one may very well suppose he looked upon their System as a step towards renouncing Christianity, and was kind to them on that account. The letter he wrote to Photinus leaves scarcely any room to doubt, that being the source of his Favour to him. (i) You seem to embrace a

very
Clergy, which was not favourable to the Arians, was involved in the Persecution. Take notice that the Latin translation of this place of Philostorgius differs from the Greek.

(b) Liban. Epist. in Fabr. Bt. vii. p. 286.

(i) Julian. Epist. ap. Facund. ubi sup. Tu quidem O Photine verisimilis videris et proximus salutare, beneficiens nequaquam in utero inducere quem credidisti Deum.

very PROBABLE SYSTEM, says he, and not far from the wholesome Doctrine; you are in the right not to allow that one whom you believe to be a God, ever was in a Woman's womb. We shall strip that new Galilæan God of Diodorus, whom he says is Eternal, of the Deity (k) forged for him by that Author. This passage shews what a great difference Julian made between the Assertors of Christ's Divinity; and those whom he looked upon as effectually destroying that fundamental Doctrine of Christianity. The former were his greatest Enemies, which appeared not only in the instance of *Diodorus*, whom he abuses indecently; but also in the case of *Atbanasius*, whom he would not suffer to resume his Episcopal See after *George's* death. He would have allowed any body else to explain the Scriptures to the *Alexandrians*, rather than that great Man, (l) whose Doctrine he wished from the bottom of his heart, to see entirely deserted; at the same time that he said not a word against that which had been preached by *George*. That Arian Bishop, as he is commonly called, was rather an *Anomæan* (or a Follower of those Principles which were at first confusedly preached by *Arius*, and afterwards revived, and more distinctly

and (k) In other places Julian acknowledges that Doctrine to be agreeable to St. John's Gospel. Cyril. x. p. 327, 333. (l) Ep. li. "Ὁμοιωτὶς τοῦ ἀθανάτου λόγου ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ φύσις αὐτοῦ διδασκαλίας κατανυκτικῶς μαχόμενα

and methodically expounded by *Aëtius* and *Eunomius*,) than an Arian, as the word was then usually understood. This is too well known to require any proof; and could not but be known to *Julian*, who had a personal acquaintance with *George*; tho' that Prelate dissembled his real sentiments, whenever there was any danger in being reckoned among *Aëtius*'s friends. Therefore what I shall say upon the title which the *Anomæan* Doctrine gave to *Julian*'s protection, may account for the Favour shewn to him, as well as for that shewn to *Aëtius*. But before we examine that point; it is not improper to say something of *Aëtius* himself, that the Reader may see how fit a Man he was to be the inventor of a new kind of Christianity, free from all Mysteries whatever.

Aëtius's (m) education was that of a Man designed for a Mechanic. After having been a Servant, he was brought up to a Trade, either a Gold or Copper-smith. It is probable he was forced to leave off that Trade, and to return to a servile life again, for before he studied Divinity we find he lived with different persons, and his Panegyrist *Philostorgius* says he was a Servant to one of them. But as his Masters were Men of Learning, he picked up something of what they taught, and from thence, he began to be a Man of Letters.

His

(m) See *G. Nyss.* adv. *Eunom.* lib. 1. T. ii. p. 292, *Philost.* iii. 15. *Socrat.* ii. 35.

His first Instructor was *Paulinus* the Arian Bishop of *Antioch*, who, it seems, taught him only Logic: But *Aëtius*, who afterwards distinguished himself by taking *Aristotle's* Categories for his rule, in determining Theological Questions, formed himself such a high opinion both of that Science, which was the first he had learned, and of his proficiency in it, that he pretended to be a Divine, before he had ever applied himself to Divinity: That he meddled with Theological matters appears from his being expelled out of *Antioch* by *Eulalius*, *Paulinus's* Successor, on account of his public disputes. Had he kept within the bounds of Logic, the Bishop could have nothing to say to him. From *Antioch* he went to *Anazarbus*; where he continued a mighty Disputer and a Servant. His first Master in that Town was a Grammarian, who taught him Grammar; but afterwards turned him out of his house, on account of his publicly arguing against him, and charging him with Heresy. By these beginnings it appears that *Aëtius* sat up early for a Divine, after which he studied Divinity. When he had left the Grammarian, he read the Gospel under the Arian Bishop of *Anazarbus*; the Epistles of St. Paul, at *Tarsus*, under an Arian Priest, (who was afterwards made Bishop of that Place,) and the Prophets at *Antioch*, under *Leontius* then an Arian Priest; who, when made a Bishop, ordained

Julian's favour to Aetius, &c. 197

ordained him a Deacon, and allowed him publicly to explain the Christian Doctrine. It is probable that by this time he had got all the Theological knowledge he ever had, and compleated his System of Divinity. Therefore I shall take no further notice of the many Disputes and Conferences wherein he was engaged. It is enough to have shewed by what method he had qualified himself to set up, as he did, for a Disputer against any one that would argue with him on Theological subjects. A great opinion of himself, a tolerable readiness at speaking, a vast deal of Logical subtilty, an indifferent knowledge of Scripture, and an utter ignorance of, together with a haughty contempt for the ancient Interpreters; were the most eminent qualifications of that worthy Patriarch of our modern pretended Christians without Christianity; or, which is the same thing, without Mysteries; for this was the central point, if I may call it so, of *Julian's* friend's System.

It is not very difficult, to know as much of that System as is necessary to the present purpose. *Epiphanius*, (who, tho' unmercifully abused by *Toland*, as an (n) ignorant, partial, bungling and confused Author, can never be supposed to have forged whole books under the name of those he confuted,)

has
(n) *Nazarenus*, p. 51, 52.

has preserved to us (o) a whole Treatise of *Aëtius*. Two Treatises of his Disciple and Companion *Eunomius* have been found in antient Manuscripts, and printed several times; one of which was even published in *English* by Mr. *Whiston*. Several passages out of another were transcribed by *Gregory* of *Nyssa*, in his books against that Author; and *Pho-tius* has preserved down to us the most essential part of an Ecclesiastical History written by (p) a great Admirer of *Aëtius*, and a zealous Follower of his principles. We have, besides, some passages taken from his or *Eunomius*'s performances, scattered in different Ecclesiastical Writers, and several books purposely written to confute the *Anomæan* Heresy, wherein it is not to be supposed that the Tenets of the Authors of that Sect were so mistaken, as to make them chiefly insist on what was no part of their Doctrine: So that those who love to complain that the opinions of antient Heretics cannot be well known at present, for want of proper monuments, must give up their complaint at least in the case of *Aëtius* and his Sectaries,

I. S.

(o) *Epiphan. hæres.* 76.

(p) See *Eunom. Exbicus* in vales. notis ad *Socrat.* v. 10. & in *Fabr. B. G. T.* viii. p. 253. *Eunom. Apolog.* ap. *Fabr. ibid.* p. 262, in the appendix to *Basil's* works T. i. p. 618. & in *Whiston's* primitive *Christ.* revived. T. I,

(q) *Philostorgius.*

1. S. Chrysostom (r) looks upon their imagining that they understood the nature of God, and were thoroughly apprized of all that belongs to it, as the source of all their errors. This was the reason of his proving the incomprehensibility of God's nature against them in five Homelies. That Tenet is also the point which the (s) *Anomean*, introduced in the Dialogues on the Trinity ascribed to *Athanasius*, begins with, and chiefly insists upon; and it was carried so far, that *Aëtius* did not stick at saying he (t) *did not know himself better than he knew God*, and *Eunomius*, that (u) *God has not a more perfect Knowledge of himself than we have*. They even pretended that the whole of Religion (w) consisted in attaining that Knowledge: It is probable this was the occasion of their being represented as requiring (x) *nothing but faith*; for in their System there was no such thing as *faith*, or belief of what one does not thoroughly understand; and their chief objection to the Orthodox was, that they (y) *adored what they did not know*; What the Fathers have quoted out of *Ano-*

mean

(r) *Chrys. de incompr. &c. Hom. ii. T. iv. p. 384: Paris 1609.*

(s) *Int. Athen. Op. T. ii. p. 472.*

(t) *Aet. ap. Ep. p. 916. Τὸν Θεὸν ἐπίσταναι τηλαυγέστατα—ὥστε μὴ εἶδέναι ἑμαυτὸν ὡς Θεὸν μᾶλλον.*

(u) *Ap. Soc. iv. 7. Ὁ Θεὸς ὑδὲν πλεον ἡμῶν ἐπίστανται, &c.*

(w) *Epiph. ubi sup. p. 917.*

(x) *G. Nyss. adv Eun. lib. i. T. ii. p. 306.*

(y) *Chrys. hom, v. p. 387. Ὁυκ οἶδας ἂν ὁ σέβεις.*

mean books now lost, exactly agrees with the Doctrine delivered in those we have. *Aëtius* insists that the word *unbegotten* must give an adequate idea of the substance of God, because it raises our notions so high that nothing can be beyond it. Therefore the reason of the idea not being adequate would be, that the name is above the thing meant by it; and then that, (*viz.* God) should be indebted to Mankind for the gift of such an eminent name. At least I take that to be the sense of this pretty intricate sentence (2) if the incomparable word *unbegotten* does not represent the substance of God, but has been invented by man (without being pointed out by the very nature of the thing) God owes some gratitude to the Inventors, since he has nothing in his essence that answers the excellency of that name. *Eunomius's* whole Apology is built upon the same principle; for if you don't grant to him that the word *unbegotten* gives a full and perfect notion of the nature of God, there is hardly one of his arguments that will hold even seemingly. S. *Chrysostom* (a) says that the *Anomeans* would doubtless find great fault with him, for saying that God was incomprehensible even to the Angels; and

Philostorgius

(2) *Aët.* cap. 14. ap. *Epiph.* p. 926. Ἐι μὴ τὸ ἀγεννητὸν τὴν ὑπόστασιν τοῦ Θεοῦ παρίστανει, ἀλλ' ἐκνοίας ἐστὶ ἀθεωπίνης τὸ ἀσύγκειτον ὄνομα, χάριν τοῖς ἐκνοήσαντι γνώσκει ὁ Θεός, διὰ τὴν ἀγέννητον ὑπόστασιν, τὴν ὑπεροχὴν τῷ ὀνόματι ἢ φέρον ἢ ἔσθαι. See also cap. 30, & seq. 47.

(a) *Chrys.* hom. iii. p. 355.

Philostorgius (b) really censures Eusebious for having said that God in his nature is unknown and incomprehensible. The same Author charges Arius, whom otherwise he admires and extols, and most of his Followers, with absurdity, for affirming that God is (c) unknown, incomprehensible and unconceivable; that he is nothing that can be expressed by words; and that he is to be comprehended only as far as every one's ability extends, but not in a manner proportionable to his Greatness.

2. In the Aëtian System, the generation of the Son, was no more a Mystery than the nature of the Father, (d) as S. Chrysostom tells us. Eunomius (e) in several places of his Apology, will have it, that the very words begotten and generation carry such distinct ideas along with them, that the substance of the Only-begotten Son of God is thereby plainly expressed; and, in the Defence (f) of that Apology against Basil the Great, he declares that he can explain that Doctrine, so as to make it comprehensible. Agreeably to that pretension, *Philostorgius* censures the Asian or Semiarian Councils of Ariminum and Constantinople, for deciding that (g) the Generation of our Saviour is unknown

(b) *Philost.* i. 2. (c) *Id.* ii. 3. & 10. 2.

(d) *Homil. de incomp.* &c. ii. p. 343.

(e) See cap. 12. & 13. in *Whiston's* transl. p. 11, 12.

(f) *Ap. G. Nyss.* Or. iii. p. 532.

(g) X. 2. Τὴν τῷ μονογενῆς γίνεσθαι ἀγνωστότητα.

known, or, as we would say it now, is a Mystery, and can be understood by none but him who begat him.

3. By the account we have given of Aëtius's education and studies, one may judge, he had not all that Knowledge from the Scriptures; and we must do him the justice to say, he did not claim that origin to his Doctrine. The utmost of his pretensions, in that respect, was, that his Notions were (b) agreeable to the meaning of the Scriptures; but as he had formed them into a System before he had consulted the Divine Oracles, so he contented himself with building upon Philosophical principles. John Damascene gives a very right account of his method. (i) He endeavoured says he, to explain the Nature of God by Aristotelician and Geometrical demonstrations; and thereby to evince that Christ cannot be of God's substance. All Antients agree in that point, and it is so well known that I need not lengthen this Dissertation with quotations from them to that purpose; but it is proper to confirm it from Aëtius and Eunomius's own writings. The Consubstantialists derived their Doctrine from the Scriptures, and therefore it was natural

(b) Aëtii præf. ap. Epiph. p. 924. Κατ' ἐννοίαν τῶν αἰνίων γεγενην. There is not as much as a single passage of Scripture alledged in the whole Treatise, which is designed to prove that the Son is not equal to the Father.

(i) Hæres. 76. T. i. p. 94.

tural, for those who pretended to confute them, to examine the passages alledged in support of their System. Yet *Aëtius*, in a short Treatise designed to enable his Sectaries, of both sexes, to withstand all who would contradict his Notions, does not quote or examine a single place of Scripture. He puts no other weapons, even in women's hands, but syllogisms, and Metaphysical arguments. Was not that giving up Scriptures, or at least intimating that no passage alledged by the Orthodox deserved consideration, except it agreed with Philosophical Notions. (k) He did not mention so much as a single Letter of the word of God; says *Epiphanius*, not a single plate out of the old or new Testament. He brought no testimony either from the Law, the Prophets, the Evangelists, the Apostles, or the Patriarchs. He alledged not a single word either of our Saviour, or the Father, or the Holy Ghost, related by the Apostles or Prophets; that the friends of the truth might know, from his own performance, that he is an utter stranger to God and the Christian Faith. It does not appear that, at *Julian's* time, the *Anomeans* had, as yet, found out any passage of Scripture fit to give their System a tolerable colour; and when they came afterwards to alledge some, they did it rather by way of illustration, than to declare the grounds of their belief. Several texts are
either

(k) *Epiph. hæres.* 76. 989.

either quoted or alluded to in *Eunomius's* Exposition of his Faith offered to the Emperor *Theodofius*; and a few in his Apology; but his main anchor is always Reasoning and Dialectic; and, what is very extraordinary, tho' he inſiſts on the proper ſignification of words not to be met with in Scripture, (and for that reaſon *(l)* rejected by the Orthodox), as the word *unbegotten* inſtead of *Father*; he will not ſuffer the Orthodox to draw conſequences from the proper ſignification of the words *Father, Son, Generation*; for, ſays he, ſpeaking of thoſe ſcriptural words, *(m)* *the nature of things is not a conſequence of words; but the force of words is, according to their reſpective kinds, to be ſuited to the nature of things.* A natural conſequence of that method was to have very little regard for the Sacred Writers, and it is what the Followers of *Aëtius* are alſo charged with. *(n)* *He has brought his Diſciples to ſuch a pitch of impudence,* ſays *Epiphanius*, a contemporary of his, *that they dare ſay any thing. They do even abuſe the Prophets and the Apoſtles, and, when preſſed with their authority, evade the argument by ſaying, the Apoſtle ſpoke thus as a man, or why do you preſs upon me paſſages out of the old Teſtament.* Theſe looſe principles on the Inſpiration of Scriptures

(l) See *G. Nyſſ* ubi ſup. p. 397.

(m) Cap. 18. *Whiſt.* tranſlat. p. 16.

(n) *Epiph. Hæreſ.* 76. p. 991.

ture did probably lead all, or some of them, to deny the reality, (or perhaps the eternity) of Hell torments; that error being charged on them by two Ecclesiastical Writers; (o) *Harmenopulus* and *Zonaras*.

I must not dissemble that *Eunomius* complains in one of his books, of those who charged him with endeavouring (p) *to offer violence to the truth by his own fictions and reasonings*; and to remove that accusation, (which, by the by, he does not call a *false* one, tho' Mr. *Whiston* has thought proper to repeat that word twice in his translation of this place) or to render himself less obnoxious to it; offers to *demonstrate* his System *out of the Scriptures themselves*. But the way he goes about his demonstration, is a new proof of the charge; for after cursorily quoting two or three passages which take up but three lines, he falls to his Philosophical reasoning again, and, instead of a demonstration out of the Scriptures, gives nothing but Dialectical sophisms, upon his favourite but unscriptural word *unbegotten*.

4. It is usual for those who make so little of the holy Scriptures to set a great value on their own Reason. This was the case of *Aëtius* and his followers. In their way of thinking there was nothing inaccessible to human

(o) *Harm. de Hær. cap. 13. Zon. int. Cotel. Mon. Eccl. Græc. T. iii. p. 466.*

(p) *Eun. Apol. cap. 21. Whist. Transl. p. 20.*

human reasoning. *Eunomius* chiefly recommended to his Disciples (q) to *prefer reasoning before the Croud*; without mentioning the ground whereon *the Croud* he speaks of builded their belief, viz. the authority of Scripture. (r) *Not to consider the nature of things*, or to be ignorant of Philosophy, is the greatest fault he finds with the Semi-Arians; and he prescribes a method to come at the knowledge of truth about such questions as this, *is the Son's substance like that of the Father*, which plainly shews what opinion he had of the most abstruse Mysteries. *There are plainly two ways cut out for the discovery of the truth in such questions; the one of which is a priori, whereby we consider the substances of things themselves, and by fair and clear reasoning we determine about every one of them; the other is a posteriori; whereby we make the enquiry from the effects to the cause, and so distinguish substances by*

(q) *Ibid.* cap. 27. M. Whiston, p. 28. translates *preferring reason before prejudice*, but λογισμὸς signifies *reasoning*; and tho' Mr. Whiston may be of opinion that the *Croud* of Christians have no foundation of their belief but *prejudice*, yet no dictionary will vouch his translating the word ἐνεδόξουν *prejudice*. In another place, cap. 24. p. 23. the same Author introduces the word of God as the ground of an argument of *Eunomius*, where that Heresiarch himself claims no other authority but his own discourse. That translation is to be read with caution.

(r) *Ib.* c. 20. p. 19. See *Eunomius's* words, ap. G. N. Q. i. T. ii. p. 317.

the creatures they make, and by their operations. Thus Philosophy shall be our only Guide; or if any share be left to Revelation by that Heresiarch, in the enlightning of our minds, it shall be only to tell us, that the Man called Jesus is that very Son of God, about the nature of whom it is the business of Reason fully to instruct us. He was so infatuated with that privilege of human Reason, (s) to understand every thing that belongs to Religion, that he railed at those who said theirs was too weak to dive into such a depth as God's nature, and represented them as either Fools or Knaves. (t) If the understanding of some, said he, is so obscured by their ill dispositions, that they cannot even see what is before them, that is no reason why others should not come at the knowledge of things that really exist. That high contempt for those who admitted Mysteries, and incomprehensibilities in Religion, was derived from his Master. Aëtius compared the Orthodox (u) to a blind, deaf and dumb woman who has been ravished, but can give no account of the Ravisher; and ridiculed them, for (w) professing a Religion that vanishes away with the sound of certain words necessary to express the Christian Be-

K 2

lief;

(s) *Theod. Her. Fab.* iv. 3. *Oper. T.* iv. p. 237.

Οὐδὲν τῶν Θεῶν ἠγνόησεν.

(t) *Ap. G. Nyss. Or.* x. *T.* ii. p. 670.

(u) *Ap. Epiph. Hæres.* 76. p. 990.

(w) See *Aëtius's* art. 18, 19, 20: *ap. Epiph.* p. 926.

lief; because, as they did not pretend to understand the full extent of those words, they did not allow the consequences drawn from them by the method of the Dialecticians; which, in Aëtius's way of thinking, was the only mean to let them subsist after the sound was over. It would be foreign to the present purpose to enter into the particulars of Aëtius's notions about the Trinity. It is enough to observe that, whether they were really agreeable to sound Philosophy or not, they had no other foundation but reasoning. Human Reason was the ultimate Judge of all Theological Doctrines, and, of consequence, nothing was admitted into his system, as a part of the Christian Religion, but what he either really understood thoroughly, or fancied he understood. I have dwelt on that fundamental principle of *Eunomianism* longer than it was barely necessary for the end proposed in this Dissertation, because I think it may be of service to true Christianity to shew that Aëtius and his Followers, whom Mr. Whiston is pleased to call (*x*) *eminent vindicators of the most primitive faith*, were the Inventors of the method whereby our modern Deists endeavour to undermine Christianity. I would not have this understood as if I affirmed that all who cry down Mysteries, and represent Christianity as differing from natural Religion in nothing, but

(*x*) *Primit. Christ. revived. T. iv. append. p. 53.*

but an historical belief of a few plain facts, are engaged in a Plot to overthrow the established Religion. It is possible some of them may be sincere in their protestations of their being attached to the Gospel; and I don't doubt, but some are really so far deluded, like the Persecutors spoken of by our Saviour, as to imagine they do service to God by railing at those Mysteries which God has made the object of our Faith. Yet it is a fact not to be denied, that, notwithstanding the like protestations, several modern Unbelievers have laboured to set all revealed Religion aside, under pretence of levelling their attack at nothing besides the incomprehensible doctrines delivered in the Word of God. *Christianity not mysterious, Nazareus, The Discourse of free thinking, Christianity as old as the Creation, The moral Philosopher, &c.* are books so well known, that my allegation stands in no need of any further proof. The Authors of those books were sensible that Christianity itself would be soon destroyed, if once they could get Mysteries rejected. *Julian*, who was as great an Enemy as they to our Religion, and as sagacious in finding out the most proper methods to annoy it, seems to have considered the attempt of *Aëtius* in the same light. He knew that to believe, (or admit, on the evidence of Revelation, that which human Reason is not able to come at) is the *criterium* of Christianity,

and used to ridicule our Faith on that account. Therefore he saw that if Christians could once be brought off from being *Believers*; which the *Aëtian* System directly tended to, he would soon persuade them to be no more called Christians.

Besides that tendency, which *Julian* could not but perceive, tho' prejudice and fondness of his own conceit might prevent *Aëtius* himself from being aware of it; the *Eunomian* System was so framed as to entitle the contrivers of it to *Julian's* favour on several accounts. I shall mention only two particulars. 1. It is a thing (y) generally known that *Arius's* Doctrine on the Trinity was derived from *Plato*, or rather, as *Dr. Cave* has observed it, from (z) *the latter Platonists* who had departed from *the ancient Doctrine of Plato in this matter, stretching the differences and gradual subordinations which the elder Platonists had made amongst the Hypotases into too wide a distance.* But *Arius*, either because he did not see the consequences of his own principles, or because he durst not go thro' those consequences, out of regard to Scripture, had fallen short of a compleat System; and his Doctrine had a tincture of Christianity. That tincture was yet stronger, in the System of those who
went

(y) See *Sandii H. E. lib. i. p. 131. Petav. D. Th. De Trin. i. 1. 8.*

(z) *Cave lives of the Fath. of the 4th Century, p. 44.*

went by the name of *Arians* at *Julian's* time; for they had departed from some of their Master's tenets, and were much nearer being truly Christians. But *Aëtius* revived the genuine principles of *Arius*, and carried the consequences of those principles so far, that his System was essentially the same with that which *Julian* had learned from his *Platonic* Masters: for as the applying the *Platonic* Doctrine concerning the second Hypostasis, to the person called Jesus, was only a difference about a meer fact, it might very well be overlooked as no material one. Now; was it not very natural for *Julian*, who had so great a value for every thing that was derived from the *Platonic* School, to bestow his favour on *Aëtius* as a Disciple of *Plato*?

2. It appears by *Julian's* books against Christianity, that his strokes were chiefly, if not only, levelled at those who contended for the Eternal Divinity of our blessed Saviour; because as they acknowledged him to be the same God with the Father, they left no room for introducing such secondary Gods as the Heathenish Theology admitted. It was very far from being so with the *Eunomians*, who never controverted that fundamental principle of the Pagan System, that a created Being may be a true God, and deserve the adoration of Mankind. *We believe*, says *Eunomius*, *in the Son*

of God, who is (a) a true God . . . not uncreated . . . not without a beginning. This being once granted upon Philosophical principles, the controversy with the Pagans could be on nothing else but the number and names of inferior Deities; and I think *Julian* would have been very well satisfied to have no other point to adjust with the Christians besides that one. It is not to be presumed that he was not sensible of that agreement of the *Aëtian* System with his own; since it had been charged as a reproach on the *Arians* as early as *Constantine*, and was still urged against *Aëtius* by the Orthodox. If it be so, says *Epiphanius*, (b) *Christianity has no advantage over the Worshipers of creatures, and is rather an Idolatry than a true service of God. Aëtius sides with the Gentiles when he says there is a great God and a little one . . . which the Gentiles themselves confess, for they say there is but one great God, and call the other little Gods, Gods, &c.*

The above considerations persuade me that *Aëtius* was indebted to his System, rather than to any thing else, for the astonishing favour he met with from *Julian*. The reasons assigned for it by (c) *F. La Bletterie* fall

(a) *Eunom.* *Exegetic.* *Fabr.* B. G. T. viii. p. 255.

ἀσυνκρίτων θεῶν . . . οὐκ ἀνίσχον . . . οὐκ ἀναρχόν.

(b) *Epiph. haeref.* 76. p. 985, 988.

(c) *Vie de Julien.* p. 188.

fall very short of what he was to account for. It is not enough to say that *Aëtius* was acquainted with *Julian* when a Private Man; for the question is, how a man of such a mean extraction, came to be so intimate with a Prince of *Julian's* rank. I say so intimate; for the manner in which *Julian* wrote to him shews he was not only an acquaintance of his, but a particular friend. It is true he had done the Apostate a very remarkable service, by helping (d) him to impose upon the World, and to conceal his Apostacy from *Gallus*; and it is what the Biographer seems to insinuate, when, talking of *Julian's* kindness to that Heresiarch, he says, that *prejudices did not always stifle in that Prince the sentiments of gratitude.* But was not gratitude rather inforced by *Julian's* prejudices in that case, than opposed to them. The nature of the Service *Aëtius* had done him is such, that it gives room to vast suspicions. The Heresiarch was sincere or he was not so, in the account he gave to *Gallus* of his Brother's being steady in the principles of Christianity. If he was not, and betrayed the trust reposed in him by the Cæsar, in an affair that so nearly concerned the interest of the Christian World; *Julian* had no reason to look on him as a great friend to the Religion of Christ, nor consequently to be prejudiced

K 5

(d) See *Vie de Julien*, p. 35.

214 *Julian's favour to Aëtius, &c.*

against him on that account. If he was; the Apostate had still less reason to hate him as a Christian; for it is very probable he had been seduced by *Julian's* Philosophy; and taken his *Platonic* topics for sound Christianity; for people of loose principles are very apt to be imposed upon in that manner. Thus *Julian* had an early opportunity of being convinced, how nearly related his and *Aëtius's* System were; and the Conferences on Theological matters they had together in that juncture, are a circumstance that give a new degree of probability to the reason I assign for the Emperor's favour to the Heresiarch. F. *La Bletterie* adds another motive of *Julian's* behaviour, to those taken from gratitude and former friendship. *This Aëtius surnamed the Atheist*, says he, *had formed a new Sect amongst the Arians, and according to Julian's System, the heads of Parties were always valuable to him.* But it would be a very difficult task to shew that *Julian* ever bestowed any particular favour upon any other head of Party among the Christians, besides *Aëtius*, *Photinus*, and perhaps *Eunomius*. What token of his benevolence, (barring the repeal from their several banishments, which was a favour conferred on all the Exiles, not on the heads of Parties in particular) did he ever give to the heads of the Consubstantialists, in several parts of the World? what to *Athanasius* whom he considered

considered as the Chief of that Party? What to *Hilary of Poitiers*, and *Eusebius of Verceil*, who were the most conspicuous amongst them, the former in *Gaul*, the other in *Italy*. What to *Lucifer of Cagliari* who, in his own time, occasioned a new schism among the Catholics? What to *Paulinus* or *Meletius* of *Antioch*, who headed each of them a considerable Party in the very City where *Julian* made a longer stay than he did in any other Place during his whole Reign? What singular favour did the other heads of the several Sects into which the *Arian* Party was divided at that time receive at his hand? *Acacius* of *Cæsarea*? *Basil* of *Ancyra*? or *Macedonius*? How were the Authors of other new Sects used, for instance *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*, and *Donatus* that turbulent *Carthaginian* Bishop? We don't find in History that any of them ever was used by *Julian* as if he had any great value for them. *Aëtius* and *Photinus* are the only heads of Party who ever were personally distinguished by that Apostate. One cannot account for the singular treatment they met with, from reasons that should have procured the same favour to many others. *Julian's* motives must have arisen from something that was as peculiar to them, as his behaviour was singular; and I am confident that, after considering what has been offered in this Dissertation, most of my

216 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

my Readers will be satisfied that the manifest tendency of their, and chiefly of *Aëtius's* Doctrine, towards overturning Christianity, was the principal, if not the only ground of their intimacy with the greatest Enemy our Religion ever had.

DISSERTATION VII.

Upon the Opinion the Pagan Philosophers at Julian's time had of the Religion they professed.

THE greatest opposition Christianity met with in the *Roman* Empire, after its becoming the Religion established by law, was from the Pagan Philosophers and other Men of Letters. As long as authority was on their side, the Heathen Priests made use of it, and stirred up the superstitious Rable against the Christians. But as soon as reason and argument became the only weapons wherewith our Religion could be attacked, they withdrew from the Field, and left the cause of the Gods by whom they lived to be fought for by those very men, who had often been branded with the name of *Atheists*. For (a) it was a staple mob opinion that *Philosophers are Atheists*. These were the only, or at least the chief, support of declining Idolatry, when *Julian* came to the Throne ;

(a) Bentley. Phil. Lips. part. ii. p. 71.

Throne; and that Emperor owns he was indebted to them for heartily embracing Paganism. Thus we may consider an inquiry into the motives which induced them to apologize for the Superstitions of their Ancestors, and the methods they employed to prop up such a ruinous edifice, as an essential part, not only of the History of *Julian's* time, but also of his own; since that Prince, not satisfied with supporting Idolatry and attacking Christianity with his authority as an Emperor, undertook to do both by arguments, and ranked himself with the Philosophers, and Controversialists.

Whilst Heathenish Superstitions were fenced by the laws of the Land, the Philosophers might be suspected of standing up for the Gods of their Country out of political views; to wipe off the aspersion of Atheism and Free-thinking. This may be supposed to have been the case of *Celsus*, who, being an *Epicurean*, could be acted by none but earthly motives; and this charge may be supported by the manner in which he carried on his undertaking. For as no Religion could stand upon the principles of his Sect, he was forced to personate the *Pythagorean* or the *Platonist*, whenever he spoke in favour of Idolatry, tho' he is a true *Epicurean* when he attacks the Jewish and Christian Religions. But the case was very different with the Philosophers who lived under
Constantine

218 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

Constantine and his Sons. They could have no inducement to act the part of Apologists for the old Superstitions, but a true zeal and sincere attachment to them. Had they been Time-servers under the Pagan Emperors, they would have continued so when Christianity was on the Throne, and complied with the humour of the times, as it is probable most of the *Epicureans* did, since there (*b*) is nothing of that Sect to be heard of under the Christian Emperors; notwithstanding (*c*) its flourishing state under *Diocletian*. Thus the behaviour of the Philosophers at that time, their zeal and steadiness were a sufficient confutation of the calumnies of the Populace.

Yet as Men who have made it their business to study any point, are generally so prepossessed in favour of their own Notions, whether true or false, that they cannot conceive how any one that examines can differ from them; these Philosophers have fallen (*d*) under a suspicion of insincerity, which I shall endeavour to clear them from. It is a piece of justice, which, however often it may be denied, yet I think is due as well from Christians to Pagans, as from all denominations of Christians to each other.

And first, I must observe that the Philosophers at *Julian's* time are not used worse than

(*b*) See *Gassendi* de tit. & mor. Epic. ii. 5, 6.

(*c*) *Laët. Div. Inst.* iii. 17. multo celebrior — quam cæterorum.

(*d*) See *La Bletterie*, p. 23.

The Philosophers sincere Heathen. 219

than their Predecessors who were better than they. The same charge laid on all Philosophers, by the Populace in the time of Paganism, has been allowed by the primitive Christians, because they thought something like Christianity was at the bottom of the pretended Hypocrisy of the Philosophers; blindly received by many Christians afterwards; (e) faintly supported by some, and mightily insisted on by (f) the modern Free-thinkers; (with what design it is easy to guess;) and never proved to the satisfaction of any candid Examiner. This makes it necessary for us to run up much higher than *Julian's* time, and to clear from this imputation those who were the fountain head of that Philosophy which seduced that Emperor from Christianity. If this be a digression, I hope it won't be an unpleasing one; tho' the compass of this Dissertation cannot allow me to enlarge upon the subject as much as it deserves. But before I come to this, it is proper to explain, in a few words, the nature of the Pagan Religion.

Scævola, *Varro*, and *Plutarch*, have spoken of a three-fold partition of the Pagan Theology. The latter says it was (g) delivered by those who instituted the worship of the Gods, which

(e) *L'abbé Anselme* in *M. de l'Ac. des Ins.* T. iv. p. 406, &c. 568. suiv.

(f) See *Blount's Origin. of Idol.* p. 9. 44. *Collins's Disc. of Freethinking*, p. 123. &c. *Toland's Clidophorus*, &c.

(g) *De plac. Phil.* I. 6. Οἱ τετὶ τῶν Θεῶν παραδόντες; σεβασμὸν.

220 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

which shews that it is nothing but a three-fold manner of considering the same Religion, viz. as a Poet, a Philosopher, or a Lawgiver. But as that distinction, which was somewhat like the method of some Divines, who consider all the subjects they preach upon, *litteraliter, tropologice, analogice, &c.* can afford no light to the point we are upon, we shall lay it aside for the present, and take a survey of the several kinds of Beings worshipped by the Pagans. They may be divided into objects of immediate, and objects of mediate worship.

Under the first head may be brought, 1. The Celestial Bodies which they looked upon as living animated Beings 2. A numberless multitude of spiritual, or at least invisible Beings, whom they apprehended to be partly coordinate, partly subordinate to one another, and endowed with great powers, so as to be able both to hurt and to benefit Mankind. 3. An indefinite number of Heroes or dead Men, whom they imagined to have been admitted into a share of the Godly power, in consideration of some egregious thing or other by them perpetrated in this World. 4. Certain things (b) which the Vulgar had no clear notion of, as *fear, courage, paleness, &c.* but which the thinking Men considered as under the inspection of some of the Beings before mentioned.

Under

(b) See *Cudworth intel. System.* p. 227, 229.

Under the second Head were, 5. The Idols, Images, Statues, and other Symbols made by the hand of Man. 6. The natural Symbols, or what they were pleased to consider in that light, whether living or vegetable creatures. No God brought under this head was worshipped on his own account, but either for its being a Symbol consecrated to, and calling to mind the idea of some Deity mentioned under the first Class, or for the sake some such Deity's being actually united to it, and residing in it.

To this Theory, which was antienter than either Poets, Philosophers, or Lawgivers known in History, if we add a few articles of Belief concerning the Gods or their worship, we shall have a general notion of the Pagan System. 1. That the Gods were not only able, but willing to meddle in human affairs; 2dly, that they had several ways of communicating themselves to men, either by assuming Human bodies for a time, or by other means, as Dreams, Oracles, &c. 3dly, That in fact, they had revealed themselves, to Men on several occasions, and given them instructions about the manner of worship, the arts of Divination, and other points relating to the particular Province of every God.

The generality of men being prepossessed with these opinions, it was not very extraordinary,

222 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

ordinary, at a time when there was no written History to preserve a distinct memory of remarkable events, that the Gods of one Class shoud be often confounded with those of another, chiefly as several known causes concurred to introduce that confusion, which proved in process of time the ground-work of still greater mistakes. Gratitude and flattery, were the most remarkable sources of that evil. The real or pretended Benefactors of Mankind were of course intituled to a rank among the Gods of the third Class. But (i) the custom having prevailed of calling Men by the Name of some Celestial Body or other, and also of transferring to Celestial Bodies the Names of Men, that 3d. Class was soon confounded with the first, and no distinction made by the Vulgar, between *Apollo*, for instance, and *the Sun*. Ignorance in point of History was a second source. Several Princes or great Men, either in different Countries, or in the same, had the same name. If any one or two of them happened to be Deified, all the Stories that belonged to that Name were made part of the History of the God. Thus crimes which shoud have excluded Men from being ranked among the Gods, came to be imputed to those who had been Deified on account of their good actions. The necessity of imposing names to the Be-

(i) See *Warburton's Divine Legation*, p. 438, 439.

ings of the 2d. Class, who were conceived as having a particular inspection on some part of this World, as the Sea, the inner parts of the Earth, &c. was a third source of confusion. It is probable they were at first denominated after such Men as were remarkable for some thing that had an affinity with the Employment devised unto those Gods. Thus the God of the Sea was called *Neptune*, as we might call the Genius of Mathematics *Newton*, or the tutelar Deity of Insects *Reaumur*. The God of a Country, was denominated after some excellent King, &c. But, in process of time the origin of the name being forgotten; the History of the King or great Man was (k) mistaken for that of the God. The God himself was supposed to have been embodied for a time, either in the natural course of birth, or otherwise, and to have revealed unto men such useful discoveries or regulations as the King or great Man was really the Author of. I don't doubt but the spirit of System may also have contributed to introduce confusion in the Pagan Theology. Men woud have a subordination among the Gods for whom they had names, for the rest however numerous, were little thought of, till some Enthusiast or other dreamed of a denomination for them: Then of course the Deities of the second Class, that had the good fortune to be

(k) See *Cudworth's intel. Syft.* p. 257.

224 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

be denominated after Men of a superior rank in this world, got the highest place in the growing System. Hence *Jupiter* was looked upon as *optimus maximus*, the best, and consequently the greatest of the created Gods, however inconsistent that title was with the stories that were told of him. There may have been other sources of confusion, but I think these were the chiefest.

Men were in possession of those Tenets, and of a Worship suitable to them (1) when the Legislators whose names are recorded in History undertook the civilizing them. These wise Men soon perceived how useful Religion would be for that purpose, and therefore the first step they took was to make that very Religion which they found rooted in the minds of the People rest upon a legal bottom. They were not satisfied with that, but being Poets (at least some of them) and Philosophers, as well as Lawgivers, they treated Religion in that threefold capacity. It was the business of the Law to prescribe and regulate the Worship of the Gods, such as they were, (m) not to teach what their nature was. This required, considering what has been said before, sound Criticism, an art which antient Sages were utterly strangers to.

(1) See *Warburton's Div. Leg.* p. 440.

(m) *Cotta ap. Cicer de Nat. D. iii. 7.* A te enim Philosopho rationem accipere debeo Religionis; majoribus autem nostris, etiam nullâ ratione redditâ credere.

to. However they supplied that defect with Philosophy and Poetry jumbled together. The Philosopher saw the most glaring inconsistencies arising from the confusion before mentioned ; but the Poet knew what fictions a bold imagination is able to create, and how wide allegory and reality differ, tho' they center in the same point. Hence the Lawgiver, without departing from the fundamental Principles of the vulgar System, concluded that the inconsistencies were only apparent ; and that the History of the Gods, as received from Tradition, must either wholly or partly be allegorized. Thus he thought he might extricate himself out of all difficulties. But that discovery, however conducive it might prove to the general good of Society, (by inculcating that Virtue and especially beneficence were the only or the chief means to ingratiate one with the Supreme Cause of all things, and to attain that degree of happiness and honour which was enjoyed by the Deified dead Men ;) was not thought fit to be entrusted with the Multitude ; because, tho' no ways repugnant to the primitive notions of the vulgar System, it carried an air of novelty ; and a degree of knowledge was required to understand it, which the generality of Mankind were not judged capable of, without a previous instruction. I take this to have been the occasion and design of instituting the

226 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

the Mysteries or secret Worship of the Gods, which was done every where by the Law-givers, as has been proved by a (n) Man whose profound Learning and bright imagination I admire, tho' I cannot come into all his Notions.

It would be both too long and foreign to our purpose to trace the joint History of Philosophy and Heathenism from those remote ages down to *Julian's* time. Therefore we shall now content ourselves with some remarks upon those from whom was derived the Theological Philosophy most in vogue in the fourth century after Christ (o). It is well known, says the ablest Critic of our age, that the then Pagan Philosophers were the *Platonists, Peripatetics, and Stoics, or rather a jumble and compound of them all*. That mixture concerned principally those matters that had nothing to do with Religion; but in point of Theology, (p) the Tenets of *Plato* were like Oracles, from which the very Disciples of *Aristotle* and *Zeno* gloried not to depart. Here it is proper to observe, that as *Plato* had borrowed the principles of his Theology from *Pythagoras*, the Followers of his Sect, as restored by *Plotinus*, went fur-

(n) Mr. Warburton in his Div. Leg. of Moses.

(o) Bentley's Phil. Lips. against Collins. part. ij. p. 45.

(p) It is what F. Baltus acknowledges *Def. des S S. P. P. accusés de Platon*. p. 105, tho' he represents that School as the less frequented of the three.

further than he had, into some of the Pythagoric notions, and for that reason (q) are styled by some learned Men indifferently *Platonists* and *Pythagoreans*. Now it is very easy to know what the Theological principles of *Plato's* School were, if a Sect's avowed Doctrine be deemed a true representation of it's sentiments : for we have, if I may call them so, several *Platonician* Confessions of Faith, which contain all the principles of Heathenism. But it is pretended these expositions of their Doctrine were only a sham to impose upon the Public, and their secret Tenets were quite destructive of their Professions. The grounds of that opinion deserve to be examined, as it is patronized by Men of very different principles and views ; some sincere well meaning Christians ; and some either avowed or secret Enemies to all forms of established Religion.

Collins, who pretends that (r) *they who have been most distinguished in all ages for their understanding and virtue have been Freethinkers*, says that *Plato*, being alarmed at the fate of *Socrates*, never talked publicly against the Gods and Religion of his Country, but thought himself into notions very contrary to those who were received or known in Greece, This brings the charge back upon *Socrates*, whose

(q) See *S. Parker's* Cens. of the Plat. Phil. & Dem. of Christ. p. 393.

(r) *Disc. of Freethinking*, p. 123, 126.

228 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

whose case, as he was one of *Plato's* Masters, we must diligently consider.

It is a very general Notion that *Socrates* suffered lawfully, tho' unjustly; that is to say, that the Indictment brought against him for *not reputing Gods those which the Republic held to be such*, was proved. It is on that account that the good Philosopher's name is always in the mouth of our modern Unbelievers. (s) *Toland* would have his Pantheistical, or rather Atheistical, fraternity denominated after him. *Blount* says he *could not escape with his life, only because he preached up the Belief of One supreme God*; and *Collins* that he *disbelieved the Gods of his Country . . . and declared his dislike*. For my part, tho' I sought for the reasons of that opinion, I must own I could not find a single one fit to give it the least degree of probability; and I am the more emboldened to contradict it, tho' almost universally received, when I see such a Man as (t) *Dr. Bentley* receding from it. (u) *Stanley* has given a very accurate account of *Socrates's* tryal, taken from antient Authors; but there is not in it the least shadow either of *Melitus's* making good that part of the charge, tho' called upon to prove it; or of the Philosopher's pleading guilty.

(s) See the very title of *Toland's* Pantheisticon, *Blount's* original of Idolatry, p. 9. *Collins* ubi sup. p. 23.

(t) *Philel. Lipsiens.* p. 23.

(u) *Stanley's* Hist. of Philosophy, p. 90.

guilty. Far from it. *Socrates*, who scorned to make use of disguise and indirect means to save his life, loudly protested that he adored the Gods worshipped by the City, and believed with all the world that the *Delphian Oracles* were delivered by *Apollo*. *Plato* has preserved to us, if we may depend upon Mr. *Dacier's* judgment, the genuine *Apology* made by *Socrates* before his Judges (w) *without adding any thing to the truth*, and that work is full of candor and ingenuity. But what do we find in that *Apology*? He says, that *all the articles of his Indictment* were down right untruths, and of a piece with the Accusation formerly laid on him by *Aristophanes*, as if he had been an Astronomer, tho' he never meddled with these Sciences; that the God who presides at Delphi was an unexceptionable Author; that he was effectually persuaded that there are Gods; that he believed and taught the being of Deities, Demons, Gods or children of Gods. And that these Demons are Gods; that he believed as other men do, that the Sun and Moon are Gods. It is true that M. *Dacier*, a great stickler for *Socrates's* Orthodoxy, pretends that some of these expressions were ironical, or spoken in compliance with the opinions of the People, and others agreeable to what we learn from

L

Scrip-

(w) See the works of *Plato* translated from the French of Mr. *Dacier* Vol. II. p. 4, 13, 14, 23, 24, 25, 26.

230 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

Scripture ; but he can never make either of these pretensions good, as they are repugnant either to the sound Doctrine of Christianity, or to the known character of *Socrates*, and inconsistent with the circumstance that Philosopher was in. After all, this was not the first time our Philosopher had declared in favour of Polytheism and Idolatry. On his being admitted a Citizen, for the *Albenians* were only *Citizen's children* till they had taken the Oath, he (x) had sworn by half a dozen of Gods not only to stick to the Religion of his Country, *ἐπὶ τὰ πάτρια τινύσσω*, but also never to suffer any body to attempt changing the Laws ; the first of which was that the Gods and Heroes of the Land should be publickly worshipped according to the forms prescribed by the Antients ; and in private by speaking well of them, *ἐν ᾠδαῖς*. As he never retracted that Oath, so we don't see that he ever did or said any thing contrary to it ; either in his Philosophical, or any other capacity. (y) *Man was the sole Subject of his Philosophy*, and esteeming speculative Knowledge as far only at it conduces to practice, he cut off in all Sciences what he conceived of least use. Thus he meddled very little with the Nature of God or Gods, only as far as Providence and motives to a good and virtuous ilfe were concerned in it, tho' he seems to have had pretty sound notions of

(x) See Sam. Pettit. *leges Atticæ*. tit. 1, & 4.

(y) Stanley ubi sup. p. 77.

of a supreme God. Yet, as he looked upon Piety as an essential part of Virtue, he recommended it to his Disciples in his most private conversations, as well as in Public ; but in such a manner as evidently shews that the supreme God was not the immediate Object of the Worship he inculcated. *Xenophon*, among many other proofs of what I say, has preserved to us a long conversation of that Philosopher with *Euthydemus*, at which he himself was present, and which was entirely taken up in proving that there are Gods, and that they must be worshipped tho' not seen : And least some body should imagine that tho' he used the *plural* number he meant the supreme God only, he makes use of the invisibility of that Being to shew that other Gods also must be honoured, tho' invisible as well as he : As to the manner of exterior worship, as it is a point which human Reason can never fully settle, he has recourse to Revelation, and advises *Euthydemus* to depend upon a Delphian Oracle, whereby men are directed to worship the Gods according to the Laws of their Country, (z) *for*, says he, *how is it possible for men to offer unto the Gods a more agreeable worship than what they prescribe.* His conduct was always suitable to that Doctrine, for he (a) *sacrificed at common festivals*

L 2

(z) *Xenoph.* Memor. iv. Ὅς αὐτοὶ καλεῖσθαι

(a) See *Stanley* ubi sup. ex *Apol. Soc. ap. Plat.*

stivals on the public Altars, so that, from his former behaviour, there is no reason to imagine that his last words, O Crito, I owe Æsculapius a cock; pay it; neglect it not; are not to be understood in the obvious literal sense. I might bring other proofs, but, as Socrates comes in this Dissertation only incidentally, it is better not to dwell so long upon what relates to him. This may suffice to shew how groundlessly Mr. Dacier pretends, that (b) Socrates attacked the Superstition of the Athenians and the plurality of their Gods, by exposing the ridiculousness of the fables with which their Divinity was stuffed, and by that means endeavouring to bring them to the knowledge of the true God. However we shall examine the words which occasioned that reflexion of the learned Translator, tho' we look upon them as expressing Plato's thoughts rather than Socrates's.

The design of the Dialogue intitled *Eutypbron* is to shew that the true rule of morality or holiness is to be taken from our notions of just and unjust, or the dictate of reason; not from the behaviour of the Gods, as recorded by the Poets, whose accounts, if literally understood, are full of absurdities. To that end *Socrates* is introduced using several arguments rather to puzzle *Eutypbron* who proposes the contrary opinion, than

(b) Introd. to Socr. Apol. ubi sup. p. 3.

than to establish, or even openly declare, his own sentiment. Amongst others he makes use of this, (c) *that the Gods being often divided among themselves, by the Poets accounts, their quarrels must needs arise from their disagreement about what is just or unjust, profane or holy; and that, according to this, one and the same thing is holy and profane, seeing it pleases some of 'em and displeases others.* The conclusion Socrates draws from that observation is, that some other rule must be sought for, and it is plain from the tendency of the whole Dialogue, that the maxim he wants to inculcate is this. (d) *That which is holy is beloved of the Gods because it is holy; not holy because it is beloved of them.* But instead of that conclusion Mr. Dacier intrudes one of his own, and fathers it upon Socrates. *Therefore, says he, in his Abridgment of Eutyphron, the definition of holy and profane can't subsist with the plurality of Gods. This consequence is certain and would be sufficient to reclaim a wise man from that error, and to convince him that there is but one God.* Whether the consequence be certain in itself or no, is what I will not examine; but it is most certain it is none of Socrates's, who does all along suppose that there

L 3

are

(c) See Dacier's Abridg. of Eutyphron, T. i. p. 324.

(d) The Maxim is proposed in an interrogative way, *is that, &c. or is it holy, &c.* *ibid.* p. 286. See Plat. Op. Ed. ferran. T. i. p. 10.

234 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

are several Gods ; tho' he will have their History laid aside when any point of morality is to be discussed ; because it seems he does not take that History to be matter of fact.

This leads me to consider the opinion *Socrates* had of the Poetical Accounts of the Gods ; which I shall do the more willingly, as his System appears to me to have been embraced and approved of by most Philosophers after him ; but especially by those who apologized for Paganism in or about *Julian's* time. *Collins* took it for granted that he (e) *disbelieved the common creeds*, which he supposes is the same with *disbelieving the Gods*, and *declared his dislike* of the established Theology ; upon which *Dr. Bentley* (f) observes that it is the *Poetical Religion* only which *Socrates* with some difficulty assents to, or very tenderly denies. The observation is right ; but might have been carried further. The literal truth of those accounts, was the only thing which could not easily go down with the Philosopher ; for, in the very place referred to by *Collins* ; after asking *Eutypbron*, whether there was truly any such thing as *Enmities and Battles among the Gods* ; and whether the things recorded by Poets had *really happened*, he compares their accounts with (g) *Minerva's veil*, which had

(e) *Disc. of free-thinking*, p. 123.

(f) *Phil. Lips.* part, ii. p. 33.

(g) ὁ τίς ποτε μετὰ τῶν τοιούτων ποικιλιὰς τῶν. *Eutyp.* p. 6

many things described in it in needle-work, or rather woven pictures, and was certainly a mysterious garment. Thus I think he points out the light in which Poetical Fables are to be considered; viz. as representations adorned with many colours; but very different in fact, from what they seem to be at first sight. This may receive some illustration from *Socrates's* declaration before his Judges.

(b) *The Poets*, says he, *say many good things, but they understand nothing of what they say. They are like Prophets and Divines. They don't carry on their work by the measure of wisdom, or any artful knowledge, but by a sort of Enthusiasm.* Plato introduces him, in one of his Dialogues enlarging upon that notion of Poetry; and proving by several arguments, that the performances of Poets are a kind of Revelation, and the Poets themselves inspired Interpreters of the Gods; and in another saying that (i) *all Poesie is naturally enigmatic.* Now had he been of opinion that no hidden sense is concealed under the fables, how could he say that the Poets themselves did not catch the meaning of the good things they uttered? The literal sense is very obvious; but *Socrates* did not take it to be a right one. Therefore he must have admitted a metaphorical or allegorical interpretation, which the Poets them-

L 4

selves

(b) *Apol. Socr. T. i. p. 22. Alcib. 2. p. 147.*

(i) Ἐπεὶ τὰ Φύσει ποιητικὴ ἢ εὐμακάρι ἀνιμασίῳδός.

236 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

selves had not in view, (*k*) being only instrumental, not willing and knowing, Interpreters of the Gods. Let us return to *Plato*.

It is almost needless to observe that, in that Philosopher's avowed System, there is but one supreme God the Source and Original of all being, who has created several inferior Beings, and caused those Creatures of the first rank to create others; that there is a vast number of those intelligent created Beings, whom he calls Celestial bodies, Gods, Demons, &c. between God and Man; that the souls of Men have a being separate from that of the body, and may, after having departed this life, be admitted into a class much superior to that of common embodied souls, and become *Genii*, a kind of Deities; and lastly that the government of Mankind has been entrusted to the created Gods by the appointment of the supreme one. These are things so universally known, that they scarcely stand in need of any observation; but it is necessary to take notice of that Doctrine's near connection with the Heathenish system of Religion. The mutual dependance of the the two Systems upon one another is so visible, that the bare exposition of both is sufficient to convince any unprejudiced person that *Platonism* is nothing but a kind of Philosophical Idolatry.

try,

(*k*) *Platon. Ion. p. 534.* κούφον γὰρ χρῆμα ταύτης ἐστὶ
... πρὶν ἂν ἐνθάδε τε γενήσῃ, &c.

try, and Gentile Idolatry nothing but a practical *Platonism*.

Now were these *Plato's* real sentiments? For, as we have seen, he is charged with having publicly professed a Religion which he disapproved in his heart, or *thought himself into notions contrary to those which were received or known in Greece*. Mr. *Dacier*, a great admirer of *Plato*, is indeed very far from laying any thing to his charge; yet he agrees with his Accusers on the main point, *viz.* that *Plato's* notions were destructive of the then established Religion; but he is particular in this, that he gives that Philosopher for an undaunted assertor of truth. (l) He endeavours says he, to re-establish natural Religion by opposing Paganism which was the corruption of it. To cure men of Superstition and Idolatry which then reigned so much in the world, *Plato* forgets nothing that might induce 'em to render God a rational worship. Another Author (m) ascribes to *Plato* a very remarkable saying, *viz.* that the world wanted a Reformer to teach men how both to pray, and to sacrifice; and that, till such a Reformer was come, it was better to abstain from Religious acts, than to practise them such as they were established.

But when we look for the grounds of such assertions, they prove to be nothing but

(l) Disc. on *Plato*. p. 6. and Life of Pl. p. 90.

(m) *L'Abbé Anselme M. de l'Ac. des inscript.* T. iv. p. 405.

238 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

misrepresentations of *Plato's* words and conduct. That *Plato* ever opposed Paganism; that he ever endeavoured to cure men of Idolatry; that he ever represented the established worship as faulty, or dissuaded men from partaking of it, are so many arbitrary and groundless positions. It is true *Plato* had very sublime notions, but it does not appear that he ever set them up in opposition to the Doctrine of Polytheism, or practice of Idolatry. Quite the reverse. He made them the ground-work of both. At least, every body, but Mr. *Dacier*, acknowledges that such was the tendency of his avowed Doctrine; and, whether he had secret tenets opposed to his public teaching, is a point which we could have no occasion to examine, had we to deal with that learned Translator only, since he does not represent *Plato* as undermining, but publicly assaulting the reigning Superstitions of his age. The Saying mentioned by *P Abbé Anselme* might be to the purpose indeed, was it as certainly genuine, as it is confidently alleged. But the only place in *Plato's* works which he can have had in view, the second *Alcibiades*, is widely different from that pretended Saying. The subject of prayer, or those things which we ought to ask, or not, is the only thing inquired after in that Dialogue. There is not the least disquisition made about the

the Object of worship, or Being addressed to ; not the least objection raised against, or the least fault found with the established Worship. Far from it : That Worship is all along supposed to be a very proper one, and such as will procure from the Gods whatever Men may ask ; But they are advised either to confine themselves within such general requests, as can never prove imprecations upon themselves ; and the example of the *Lacedemonians* is recommended to that purpose, whose form both for public and private prayers was this, (n) *O Gods give us what is honest and what is good ;* or if they will come to particulars, which *Socrates*, here introduced as usual, does not seem to approve in general, to wait till they have such a distinct knowledge of good and evil, as not to be apt to mistake the one for the other. It is said further, that such a knowledge can never be attained but by the help of some God, whom I take to be in that place the *Guardian Angel*, according to the known Doctrine of *Socrates* and *Plato*. But there is not a single word of the World wanting a Reformer to alter, correct, or amend the established Worship.

Few, if any, learned Men will side with Mr. *Dacier*, in his ascribing to *Plato* an avowed opposition to Paganism ; but so many have attributed to all Philosophers, without distinction, a secret dislike of it, that

(n) Alcib. 2. p. 148. τὰ καλὰ ἐστὶ τοῖς θεοῖς ἀγαθόν :

that the grounds of that persuasion well deserve a particular inquiry.

It must be owned that some, among the Stoics, have spoken of several Rites and Ceremonies used in the worship of the Gods, and of the Poetical accounts of them, in such a manner, as leaves little doubt of their having inwardly condemned the Religion of their Country : But these were such as, on Religious matters, retained more of the *Cynic* (o) origin of their Sect, than the generality of *Zeno's* Followers ever did. *Seneca* was one of those *Half-cynic* † Disciples of *Zeno*. He had studied under *Demetrius* the *Cynic*, and shews a great admiration for the Man, and vast dependance upon his sayings, in several places of his works. Now, what (p) *St. Austin* quotes, as taken from *Seneca's* Book against Superstition, and the doctrine contained in some of his Letters, is so much like the principles of the *Cynics*, and so different from the genuine Stoic Doctrine as delivered by *Balbus* in *Cicero's de natura Deorum* ; that there is good reason to think he had that part of his System from *Antisthenes* or *Diogenes*, rather than from *Zeno*. But I do not pretend that the *Cynic* Sect did not ridicule and censure all that seemed venerable to the rest of Man-kind.

(o) See *Just. Lipsi. Man. ad Phil. Sto. i. Dis. 13.*

† *Mr. Warburton* calls him a *Mongrel*.

(p) *Aug. de Civ. D. vi. 10, 11.*

kind. The fundamental principle of their Philosophy was (q) *to despise all received notions, and opinions admitted by other Men*; and their carrying that principle so far, as to speak irreverently of the Objects of Pagan worship, was the occasion of *Julian's* writing the two Discourses, wherein he vainly endeavours to shew that the Founders of the Sect had been devout Adorers of the Gods. Had those who talk of the Philosophers dislike of the established Religion of the Pagans, confined themselves to the *Cynics*, I woud join with them. But it is well known that the *Cynic* Sect never was extensive enough to ascribe its Tenets to the generality of Philosophers; tho' that mistake has prevailed with many, on account, it seems, of *Seneca's*, and perhaps some other *Stoic's* Cynicism in speculative Theological Questions. As for the bulk of the *Stoics*, it is certain they acknowledged (r) *a multitude of Gods*. In their System the World was God; the Sun, the Moon and every Star were Gods. *Castor*, *Pollux*, and others who had manifested themselves unto Men were to be reputed Gods. The very Gods mentioned by the Poets were not laid aside, tho' the fabulous accounts of them were rejected

(q) *Jul. Or. vii. p. 225.* *πάντων ὑπερβαίνον τῶν νομισμάτων, καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων δοξῶν, &c.*

(r) *Cic. de N. D. 59. & 2. 6—14, 15, 16, 43, 60, 61, 71, 72.*

242 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

ted with indignation ; for it is observable that the *Stoics* did not pay that respect which other Philosophers did to Mythologists, and, almost entirely bent, in their Theological speculations, upon allegorizing nature, generally spoke as if Poetry had no right to tropology and metaphor. Yet, in the main, their System was far from being irreconcilable with the holdest fictions of Poetry, for *Seneca* himself allowed a multitude of Gods begotten by the supreme Being to be his Ministers and Servants in this World. (s) *He is, says he, the God of Heaven and of all the Gods. The Deities, whom we adore and worship separately, have no being but by him . . . tho' he extends his own essence thro' the whole body of the Universe ; yet he has begotten the Gods to govern his Kingdom by them, as by inferior Ministers, that every thing might have its proper Governors.* Is not that the very System of *Homer* and *Hesiod* divested of the ornaments of Poetry ? They acknowledged the Existence, not only of those Gods whom they thought their reason forced them to admit, but of those also who might as well not have existed, and whose being could be originally known no other way but by Revelation, and the certainty of their having revealed themselves made out only from common report and Tradition ; such as were (t) the *Fauni* and other

(s) *Seneca* *Fragm.* Lips. Edit. *Fragm.* x.

(t) *Balbus* the *Stoic* ap. *Cic.* de N. D. ii. 6.

other terrestrial or aquatic Deities. They allowed also, that Men who had been serviceable to Mankind, during their life, were (u) rightly accounted Gods after their death, for that reason that their Souls were both excellent and eternal; and, as to particular Persons, they appealed to apparitions of Deified Men, whereby they endeavoured to prove that they were really Gods. Now, if some Gods had been Men, there was no impropriety in describing their lives: and as they were not supposed to have been infallible during their abode in this world, tho' their good qualities had been superior to the bad ones, there was no absurdity in speaking of their frailties, tho' it might have been more prudent not to mention them as the Poets did. After so many concessions, one can never impute the hard censures passed upon the Poets by the Stoic Philosophers, to a real difference in any of the main points of their Religious Systems. It should rather be ascribed to the haughty

fourness
(u) Ibid. ii. 62. after enumerating several Deified Men, as Hercules, Castor, Pollux, Esculapius, &c. he adds; quorum cum remanerent animi atque æternitate fruerentur; Dii rite sunt habiti, cum et optimi essent et æterni. Upon which Lescapier observes that the word rite means recte, ut par erat; and as a proof of this one may read ibid. 6. where the being of the Gods is partly proved from some Apparitions of Castor and Pollux. Præsentiam sæpe Divi suam declarant ut . . . in nostra acie Castor et Pollux ex equis pugnare visi sunt.

244 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

journalists of that Sect, which prompted them to find fault with every thing and every body that was not sanctified by belonging to their School.

Another ground of the charge laid upon Philosophers in general, as if they had inwardly disapproved the Religion which they outwardly conformed to, is their not admitting what *Collins* would call the *common Creeds* about the state of not Deified departed souls. But if these pretended *common Creeds* were not so very common. The Poets talked of the *Inferi*, *Tartarus*, and *Elysium*; but it would be a difficult task to prove that what they said on those subjects was generally understood in a plain literal sense. There must be a difference allowed between the *common Creeds* and the *common Phrases*. The generality of people believed that there were rewards and punishments after death, and, notwithstanding what Mr. *Warburton* says to the contrary, it is allowed by almost all the Learned, that the generality of Philosophers did so too. But did the generality of people, more than the generality of Philosophers, believe that these rewards and punishments were in fact such as the Poets had poetically described them. Certainly they did not; as appears from the following passage of *Cicero*, where he introduces *Ballus* reckoning the belief of that point among those articles which no body,

not even the most credulous old Women admitted as matter of fact. (w) *Who imagines that there has ever been such a thing as an Hippocentaur, or a Chimera; or where is the old Woman so stupid as to be afraid of those wonderful things which the Ancients believed to be in Hell.* It is true he ascribes that belief to the Ancients; but why should not we think that the generality of people among the Ancients had as much sense as the old Women in Cicero's time, and that the former were as able as the latter to see thro' the Poetical Allegories? The nearer they were to the origin of those Mythologic accounts of Hell, the better they might know of what nature they were. 2dly, That doctrine of rewards and punishments in the next world did not properly belong to the Pagan Theology, or at least it had no influence on the established Worship. That there had been no such Hell as the Poets described, all the Gods, and even *Pluto* himself, might have preserved their several Dominions, and been entitled to the worship usually paid to them. As the public Religion was no way affected by the opinions that people might entertain about the future state of rewards and punishments, so we don't find that any one's Religion was ever called in question before the Magistrates, on account of his sentiments on that article.

(w) De N. D. ii. 5. Quæve anus tam excors? &c.

246 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

tho' several were prosecuted as Atheists, on account of their Astronomical Tenets. Therefore it is not reasonable to take a handle from the never disowned opinions of the Philosophers concerning the Poetical Hell, to suspect their sincerity in professing a Religion and practising a Worship that had nothing to do with it.

But these are only the general grounds of suspicion. We must now examine some more special ones, which may be reduced to four heads, 1. The Philosopher's Doctrine concerning the unity of God. 2. The distinction between the *Exoteric* and the *Esoteric* Doctrine. 3. The secrets revealed in the celebration of the Mysteries. 4. The nature of the Arguments brought by the Philosophers in vindication of the Heathen Religion.

The Doctrine of ancient Philosophers concerning the Unity of God.

The Unity of God, as taught by ancient Philosophers, deserves a particular attention, because most mistakes on the Subject we are now endeavouring to clear up, arose from a misapprehension of that Doctrine, and of that of Polytheism. It has been very justly observed, that our examining Antiquity with our modern notions, and making use of words which have now a different signification from that they had formerly, is fit for nothing else but to turn it all topsy-turvy.

turvy. The word *God* is one of those which, are not equivocal with us, but were so among the Ancients. At present it signifies nothing among the Christians, but the supreme Cause of all being, to which we justly ascribe all those attributes which are necessarily implied in the notion of absolute perfection; But formerly it meant, besides that, any Object of Worship; and any intelligent Being superior to Mankind. Places might be produced, even out of Scripture, to these three different significations, and, as to Gentile Writers, whoever has ever read any of them will require no proof of what we say. Now the Question is, whether the Philosophers who spoke of the Unity of God took that word in the first, the second, or the third Sense.

No body, that I know of, has ever attempted to produce any passage where it was taken either in the second or in the third. Yet that should have been done before their Monotheism could be represented as opposed to the multitude's Polytheism or established Religion; for the most ignorant and silly multitude never admitted a multiplicity of Gods, if you take that word in the first sense. They admitted a multiplicity of Objects of Worship indeed, and those Objects they called Gods, but (*) *the Objects of worship in Paganism and Polytheism*, says a very

(*) Bentley. Phil. Lips. 1. Part. p. 21.

248 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen*

ry good judge of Antiquity, had not all the attributes, nay generally not one of them, that we now ascribe to God, so that the notion of Heathen Idolatry has been very often wrong stated. The learned Cudworth has set this matter in its true light. (y) "This is that, " says he, which seems to be essentially included in the Pagan notion of the word " God or Gods, when taken in general, " namely a respect to Religious worship. " Wherefore a God in general according to " the sense of the Pagan Theists, may be " thus defined; *An Understanding Being superiour to Men, not originally derived from " senseless matter, and look'd upon as an Object for Men's Religious worship.* But this " general notion of the word God is again " restrained and limited by differences in " the division of it. For such a God as this " may be either *eternal; ingenerate or unproduced, and consequently Self-existent; or " else mortal; generated or produced and dependent on some higher Being as its cause.* " In the former sense the intelligent Pagans " acknowledged only one God; But " in the latter they admitted of many Gods " as Objects of their Religious worship. And thus the Pagan Theists were " both Polytheists and Monotheists in different senses; they acknowledged both " many

(y) Cudworth intellect. Syst. p. 232.

"many Gods and one God, that is many inferior Deities subordinate to one Supreme."

From this exposition of the System of the Philosophers, which may be depended on as genuine, 'tis easy to judge how groundless are the reproaches so often thrown upon them, as if by complying with the worship of many Gods they had shamefully concealed their knowledge of one God. In their way of thinking the many Gods and the one God were very well consisting together, and hence it appears that the Moderns who, like (z) *L'abbé Anselme*, charge them with a shameful prevarication on this point, without any other reason for so doing, besides those great Men having known that there is but one original Cause of all things, have entirely mistaken the subject they speak of. But, says one, this was different from the Religion of the Multitude, and of consequence, since the Philosophers outwardly conformed to the established Religion, they conformed to something that was different from their real Sentiments. If the difference should be denied, I know no express passage in any Pagan Author that could be alledged to support it. But it is enough for me that *S. Paul* says of the Gentiles in general, they were without God in this World; which I take to mean that they had never raised their thoughts to so sublime a contemplation

(z) *Mem. de l'Acad. des inscript.* p. 569.

as that of the supreme God. In this sense I allow that the Religion of the Philosophers was different from that of the Vulgar, as the whole is different from some of its parts. But this is quite the reverse of what is suggested in the objection just mentioned; for thus the speculative Religion of the Philosophers was more comprehensive than that of the Multitude, instead of being less so. They believed more, instead of believing less; for, besides the *many Gods* in the belief of whom they joined with the Multitude; they believed in God Almighty, whom the ignorant Multitude did not even think of. Their case was very near the same with that of a learned Country Parson with respect to his Parishioners. His belief may in some respect be said to differ from theirs, because it is more extensive. Yet he is not an Hypocrite when he recites the Apostle's Creed as a Confession of his faith, because tho' he believes other points besides those mentioned in that Symbol, and which his Parishioners have no knowledge of, yet he believes none that is contrary to that common Standard of his and the Vulgar's faith. Thus to give the objection a real strength it shoud be proved, either that the Multitude denied the Unity of God, which the Philosophers affirmed, or that the Philosophers affirming the Unity was, even in their own way of thinking, irreconcilable

able with the Doctrine of multiplicity. But neither of these suppositions can ever be made good.

As to the first it is almost needless to take notice of it, so notoriously certain it is that the Doctrine of two Principles is the (a) nearest approach that was ever made to Polytheism, if you take that word for a Doctrine that admits of more than one *Self-existent* Being. But that Doctrine was a Philosophical, not a popular one, or if it was any where a Popular Doctrine, it was not in those places where the Monotheist Philosophers we are speaking of conformed to the established Religion, and consequently it is quite out of the question. As for the multitude of Gods worshipped by the *Greeks* and *Romans*, among whom these Philosophers lived, they were never understood by the most stupid Pagans to have existed from all Eternity, or to be possessed of all the Attributes which we must enumerate when we define that God whom with the Philosophers we say to be but ONE : nay, as *Bentley* observes, they were scarcely understood to be possessed of any one of them. The learned *Cudworth* has two very remarkable observations upon this subject, viz. (b) That the ancient Christians never did *seriously charge the Pagans with* admitting of more than

(a) See *Cudworth. ubi sup. p. 213.*

(b) *Cudworth. ubi sup. p. 226, 231.*

252 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

than one Self-existent God ; and that the Christians themselves being accused by the *Manichæans* of *Paganising* in the Article of *Monarchy*, as deriving this Doctrine of one Deity the sole principle of all things, only by Tradition from the Pagans, did not, in their answers, disown that agreement of their Doctrine with that of the Pagans on the article of Unity. Thus it appears that if the Philosophers did not agree with, at least they did not disagree from the Multitude in that point.

There is as little reason to pretend that they were sensible of a contradiction between the Doctrine of *Monotheism* as explained, and that of *Polytheism* ; for there is really none. The Existence of those Beings, whom they called Gods, is partly acknowledged by us, as well as by them ; and, as for their looking on them as proper Objects of Worship, I own it was a wrong and unwarranted notion. But there is a wide difference between an arbitrary or unwarranted notion, and a contradictory one, or a notion that is destructive of self-evident Principles. We Christians, I shoud say we *Protestants*, we know that no Being but one is a proper object of Religious Worship. But how do we know it ? Is it by force of reason ? For my part I know it only because the Scripture tells me, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him on-ly*

ly shalt thou serve. If it was not for Revelation, I should be at a loss how to answer one who should urge me with the Arguments anciently used by the Heathen, and at present by the Roman-Catholics, in favour of a subordinate Worship paid to Beings infinitely inferior to God, but vastly superior to Men. Even now, if Scripture was laid aside, I don't think we could go further than saying there is no argument arising from the nature of things sufficient to prove the existence, much less the necessity or propriety of worshipping such Beings. But could we affirm that it is contrary, either to the nature of things, or to the known perfections of God, to appoint some Beings as Mediators between him and us; and to command or allow us to demand from those Beings such things as are committed to their care and distribution? I don't think we could. Yet this is what the Philosophers should have been able to decide, before they could see any contrariety or opposition between their Doctrine of one God, and their worshipping of many Gods.

This was the case of Philosophers in general, whatever Sect they might belong to; but when we come to consider that of the Platonists in particular, we shall find that they had thought themselves into notions, which made the worship of many Gods, or secondary Beings, not only lawful, but necessary

254 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

cessary. The sublime Idea they had of the Supreme God, made them rightly conclude that there is an infinite distance between him and Men ; from that right conclusion they inferred another, which was a wrong one, but appeared very right in their eyes ; viz. that there can be no immediate communication between that Being and us. (c) *God does not converse with man* ; was an axiom with them ; and they extended that principle, not to the supreme God only, but to several Classes of created Beings, whom they placed in the first ranks next after the Almighty, and whom they properly called *Gods* by way of distinction from the inferior Deities, which were sometimes so styled (only, if I may use that expression, by courtesy, as the Duke's and Earl's sons among us are styled *Lords* tho' they are but *Commoners* ;) but ought to have been properly called by the name of *Dæmons*, *Genii*, or *Heroes*. Yet they were sensible that there must be some kind of intercourse or other between the Creator and his rational Creatures. But how could such an intercourse be established, since, in their System, God was inaccessible ? It was by the means of the inferior Deities, who ought to be addressed to in order to approach the superior ones thro' their Mediation, and, thro' the mediation of the superior Gods, the very original

(c) *Plato Symp. p. 203. Θεὸς δὲ ἀνθρώπῳ οὐ μίγνυται.*

original Cause of all things. *Apuleius*, after putting that supreme God entirely out of the question; because he is so much above us, that even the most purified human Intellect can scarcely approach his Majesty; and barring all immediate correspondence between us and the first Class of both visible and invisible Gods, as the Platonists called them, proposes himself this objection, (d) “is there no connection between the several parts of Nature? Is it so thoroughly divided into Divine, and human, that there should be an interruption, and one might say a fault, in the Texture; for . . . the chief prerogative of the sublimity of the Gods consists in their being free from all impurity arising from an immediate commerce with us.” His answer to that difficulty is the only plausible bottom upon which the Heathenish worship could ever rest. “This is not surprising of the immortal Gods, says he, since, even among Men, as soon as one has been raised to an unsteady Throne it is but seldom he gives access to his person . . . for conversation is the occasion of contempt; . . . what then shall I do (will one say) if I acquiesce to this Doctrine of yours, which is sublime indeed, but very little accommodated to human necessities? If it be true that Men are
M 2 “kept
(d) *Apul. de Deo Socrat.* p. 671, &c. Ed. Delph.

256 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

“ kept at such a distance from the immortal
 “ Gods, and in such manner banished on
 “ this Earth, as if they were in Hell, as to
 “ be deprived of all commerce with the
 “ Heavenly Gods to whom shall I
 “ address my Prayers ? Whom shall
 “ I implore to help me in misery ; to pro-
 “ tect me during the good, and avert from
 “ me the bad fortune ? By whom shall I
 “ swear ? *Plato* shall give an answer
 “ agreeable to his System. I do not pre-
 “ tend, says he, that we are separated and
 “ estranged from the Gods in such a man-
 “ ner, that our Prayers cannot come before
 “ them ; for I deny their immediate ap-
 “ proach to, only, not their taking care
 “ of human affairs. There are certain me-
 “ diating Godly Powers dwelling in this
 “ air between the highest Æther and our
 “ Earth, by whom our desires and de-
 “ serts are carried to the Gods ; whom they
 “ call in Greek *Dæmons*. They are between
 “ the inhabitants of Earth and those of
 “ Heaven, Carriers of prayers and de-
 “ mands from hence ; of gifts and suc-
 “ cours from thence ; and a kind of In-
 “ terpreters and Messengers Some
 “ of them are appointed to take care, ac-
 “ cording to the province allotted to each,
 “ of every thing whereby we get
 “ an insight into futurity It is not
 “ worth the while of the superior Gods to
 “ meddle

“ meddle with those things, which are the
“ occupation of the mediating Deities dis-
“ persed in the air.” These Tenets were the
very soul of the Platonic Theology, and
there is no Philosopher of that Sect but
might afford as full evidence about them as
Apuleius. Let any one who doubts it con-
sult *Plato* himself, *Alcinous*, *Proclus*, *Por-
phyrius*, *Iamblicus*, *Julian*, or any other
he pleases; the same Principles shall be
found every where. Now the question is
not whether those notions were right or
not. I allow they were wrong, but Philo-
sophers who took them to be right could
never imagine that the belief of an only
unaccessible God should clash with the ser-
vice paid by the Vulgar, and by them-
selves, to a numberless multitude of Dei-
ties, whom they considered as Mediators
between Men and superior Beings. The
Platonists held other principles from which
Idolatry sprung as naturally as from that;
but my aim is not to give a compleat noti-
on of their System, and what has been said
is more than sufficient to clear them from
the charge of hypocrisy, as far as that
charge is supported by their having been ap-
prized of the important Doctrine of the
Unity of God.

The Distinction between the Exoteric and the Esoteric Doctrine of the Philosophers examined.

The next support of that charge lyes in the so much talked of distribution of the Philosophers Doctrine into *Esoteric* and *Exoteric*. In examining this ground of suspicion I shall have chiefly to deal with two Authors of very different principles and views; *Toland* who wanted to shew that the ancient Philosophers were Hypocrites, in order to make people imagine that all Men of sense who profess an established Religion are Cheats; and *Mr. Warburton* who, whatever the method he takes may be, certainly aims at establishing the truth of Revealed Religion. The former, notwithstanding the magnificent promise of his Title, (e) to publish the *Key* of ancient Philosophy, has given us but a poor performance, wherein he often misrepresents the opinions of the Ancients. The latter, notwithstanding his sincerity and great Learning, could not help sometimes seeing the passages he refers to thro' the Hypothesis he had embraced; and thus giving the Readers his own thoughts instead of those of the Philosophers. Our part is to avoid those failings as much as we can, in order to set the matter

(e) *Clidophorus*, i. e. Key-bearer.

ter in its true light ; and first we must take care to state the Question right. It consists only in this, whether the *Esoteric* and secret Doctrine was a contradiction of, or only an improvement upon the *Exoteric* and public tenets of each Sect ; for that there was a real distinction between both I do not pretend to deny, and no body will, that has been any way conversant with the Ancients.

The occasion of the first rise of that distinction, if once certainly known, would throw a great light upon the very nature of it. But this is a point which has been overspread with such a cloud of prejudices, that it is not easy to clear it up entirely. *Toland*, who is always ready to throw upon the Priests the blame of all the real or imaginary mischief he meets with in the world, does not hesitate at making a combination between Priests and Princes, which he calls a *holy tyranny*, the occasion of introducing the distinction we are speaking of. (f) *The Philosophers*, says he, *were constrained by this holy tyranny, to make use of a twofold doctrine ; the one popular accommodated to the PREJUDICES of the vulgar, and to the received CUSTOMS or RELIGIONS : the other Philosophical, conformable to the NATURE OF THINGS . . . WHICH WITH DOORS FAST SHUT, and under all other precautions, they communicated only to friends of known probity,*

M 4

prudence

(f) *Tetradymus* p. 65. *Clidoph.* §. 1.

260 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

prudence and capacity. In another place he lays the whole blame on the Priests, without so much as mentioning the Civil Magistrate. (g) " We ought, says he, most carefully " to observe, that the Priests were every " where the cause, why the Philosophers " invented those occult ways of speaking " and writing. [Allegories] . . . left, being " accused of impiety by the Priests, (which " often happen'd) they might be exposed " to the hatred, if not to the fury of " the Populace." All this is nothing but a groundless surmise, visibly calculated to make the name of *Priest* odious; for, in the whole Dissertation of the pretended *Key-bearer*, there is not a single passage alledged to support that, so much recommended, observation. It is even remarkable that, except * *Parmenides*, whose words he man-
gles

(g) Ibid. p. 94. §. 12.

* It will not be improper here to observe that *Plutarch* positively says *Parmenides* had not a double doctrine, and plainly insinuates that this was also the case of ancient sages: These are his words, *Parmenides*, as he was an ancient Philosopher, delivered no mysterious doctrine, but wrote a System which was his own, not a borrowed one, and different from his FUNDAMENTAL TENETS. Advers. Cototem. p. 1184. These last words διαφορὰν τῶν κυρίων are a lash given to his antagonist *Colytes*, on account of *Epicurus's* κυρίαι δόξαι, which *Plutarch*, with most Philosophers who were not of that Sect, took to be not only different from, but opposed to the avowed tenets of the *Epicureans* concerning the
nature

gles and mistranslates, as has been partly observed by (b) Mr. La Chapelle, the first persons our Author introduces as having made use of the *double Doctrine*, are *Priests*. (i) *The Egyptians*, says he, *had a twofold Doctrine . . . who is there, that is ignorant of their sacred Letters, Hieroglyphics, Forms, Symbols, Enigmas, and Fables?* But who is there, that is ignorant of all these *sacred* things having been the *Letters, Hieroglyphics, &c.* of the *Egyptian Priests*? Are we then to imagine that these *Priests* were in awe of themselves; and afraid lest they should turn self-haters, and self-persecutors, if they had not *concealed* from themselves *their sentiments of the nature of things, under the veil of Divine allegories?* This is pure nonsense; but it is nonsense unavoidable in *Toland's System*. Now, since his pretended master-key fails us, we must look for another, in order to penetrate, if possible, into the secret of the *double Doctrine*. Some of the passages which inform us of the very being of the distinction, will, if I am not mistaken, give us likewise a tolerable

M 5 rable
nature of the Gods. However, tho' one may conclude from this passage that the *double doctrine* is of a later date than Philosophy itself, at least in *Greece*, it would be wrong to construe it into a proof that there was no such thing before *Parmenides*; for *Pythagoras* was *ancient* than he.

(b) In his *Biblioteg. Angloise*. T. ix. p. 255.

(i) *Tetrad.* p. 70. §. 3.

262 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

rable information of the occasion of introducing it, which I take to have been double.

And first, the dulness and stupidity of the Vulgar, that is scarcely able to understand the easiest and simplest speculations, much less those that are sublime and remote from the common apprehension of Mankind, made the Philosophers conclude, that it was both impossible and dangerous to acquaint the Multitude with the great discoveries they thought they had made concerning the supreme God. To the impossibility we have the express words of *Plato*. (k) *To discover the Creator and Parent of this Universe is difficult; but to explain his nature to the Vulgar, impossible.* *Apuleius* (l) makes that impossibility of explaining the nature of the Supreme God an argument for saying nothing of him, in the account he gives of the several Beings above us. The danger is spoken of in one of *Demophilus's* sentences; but in such a manner as shews that the unlearned Multitude, and not the Philosopher, was endangered by the latter's speaking of God. (o) *It is not safe, or prudent, says he, to speak of God before men who have preconceived false opinions; for whether truth be told upon such a subject or falsehood, it is dangerous.* Now if *Toland's* Key be right, there

(k) In *Timæo* p. 28. Ἐἰς πάντας ἀδύνατον λέγειν.

(l) *Apul. de Deo Socrat.* p. 669.

(m) *Demoph.*

Sent. p. 40. Τ' ἀληθὴ λέγειν καὶ τὰ ψευδῆ κίνδυνον φέρει.

there was no danger in telling falshood ; and this was the only use of the Exoteric Philosophy. But it is plain that *Demophilus's* meaning is this ; When men are prepossessed in favour of false opinions concerning the Deity, a Philosophical discourse upon that subject will rather do them harm than good ; for, if you tell them such things as suit their false notions : they shall be confirmed in them ; if you tell truth : the force of prejudice is such that they will strive to oppose you as much as they can ; and, if they can't hold their former tenets, they'll rather run into an opposite and worse excess, than agree with you. The Philosophers were afraid, it seems, lest the inferior Deities, whose Worship was necessary in their System, shoud be forsaken, if once the Multitude shoud hear of another God superior to them ; or that Atheism shoud prevail, if the sublime Doctrine of a God unaccessible to all our senses shoud be proposed to men accustomed to call *nothing*, whatever they can neither see nor touch nor hear. As for the fear of being exposed to the fury of the populace, tho' it † refrained some Atheists from professing their true sentiments, I don't remember to have seen it mentioned by any Theist Philosopher, except it be to say that it was not the motive of their acknowledging

† *Cic. de Nat. D. i. 63.*

264 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

knowledging the Gods. (n) *Why don't you deny that there are Gods?* Says Cotta, even to *Velleius* an *Epicurean*. You dare not, and you are in the right; tho' in this place you are not afraid of the Populace, but of the Gods. Let us observe, by the by, how much people are mistaken, who imagine they have found a proof of the antient Sages having been refrained by the dread of the penal Laws, from declaring their true sentiments, whenever they light upon a passage where fear is mentioned as the motive of their acknowledging or worshipping the Gods. Now what must the Philosophers have done? Supposing they were both wise and honest, they must have behaved just in that manner which *Toland* takes for a proof of their having been otherwise; for, whatever ironical encomiums he may bestow on Time-servers, the World will always stile them Hypocrites and Cheats. They did not take the knowledge of the Supreme God to be essential to a right Worship; since, on account of his remoteness from us, the Religious service was not and could not be directly addressed to him, but to subordinate Deities, which the Multitude was sufficiently, tho' not Philosophically and perfectly acquainted with. On the other hand, that knowledge was so far beyond the reach of the common run of Mankind, that it was needless

(n) *Ib.* 86. Non populum metuis sed Deos.

needless and of dangerous consequence to talk of it in a public manner. Yet the Multitude was not to be entirely destitute of those instructions which it might both understand and make a right use of. Thus the Philosophers must either have confined themselves to this latter kind of instructions, as it seems *Socrates* did ; or imparted their most sublime discoveries to such only as were capable to understand, and disposed to make a right use of them. I don't know what other people may judge of these two different methods ; but, for my part, as there was more good likely to ensue from the latter than from the former, I think it was the part of both wise and good Men to pursue it, and consequently to distribute their Doctrine into *Esoteric* and *Exoteric*.

Mr. *Warburton* who acknowledges that the Philosophers did not conceal their *Esoteric* Tenets on account of any fear of Persecution, but for the sake of the public good, charges them nevertheless with an intention of deceiving the Multitude. But he brings no direct authority to prove that intention ; therefore I must be excused for taking no notice of the charge. I shall hereafter examine his indirect reasons taken from the behaviour of the antient Sages.

But besides the noble origin of the double Doctrine, already explained, I don't doubt but there was a meaner one. Most Philosophers

266 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

phers were Teachers by trade, and their bread depended upon engrossing the business, which would have ceased to be a profitable one, if every body had been admitted to hear every thing, without paying the Professors fee. Thus it was thought adviseable to raise the merit and price of knowledge by keeping it within the sanctuary of the School: and at the same time to let some few rays of that light which shined within slip abroad, in order to excite the curiosity of the Public, and to invite many to become hearers ἀκούοντες of the Doctor. *Clemens Alexandrinus* does not expressly mention that motive, but what he says (o) of the care taken lest the treasures of Wisdom ACQUIRED WITH SO MUCH TROUBLE should be profaned, by imparting them to People who had not gone thro' all the forms of Philosophical instructions, leaves very little doubt about it. *Aulus Gellius* has preserved to us two Letters to and from *Alexander* and *Aristotle*, which, together with his own commentary on them, put the thing past controversy. (p) *Aristotle* had published some books of the *Acroatic* or *Esoteric* kind: *Alexander* blamed him for it, because, said he, those who had not the advantage of hearing you may thus become equal to us your Disciples. *Aristotle* answered that the publication of his books could

(o) Strom. v. p. 680. Τὰ μὲν τὰ τοιοῦτον ἀγάντων προσιόντων.

(p) *Aul. Gel. Noct. At. lib. xx. c. 5.*

could not have that effect, because they were written in such a manner, that none but his Disciples could understand them. It is plain from thence, that the keeping up the credit of the School was the great reason for not imparting the *Esoteric Doctrine* to the Public. But that reason which could influence the Disciples only as a *point of honour*, was a very material point of interest with the Teachers. *Gellius's* commentary sets this yet in a greater Light; but as it touches upon the very nature of the *double Doctrine*; it carries us naturally to the disquisition of that point, to which our inquiry into the origin of the distinction has prepared the way.

From what has been said it appears that the Philosophers were not *constrained by the holy Tyranny* of the Priests, as *Toland* says, to make use of a *twofold Doctrine*; but did it out of choice. This is confirmed by the nature of the subjects which were treated of, *with doors fast shut*, and communicated to none but Friends. I don't deny but some of them were of a very high nature, and such as the first origin of the double Doctrine, as before explained, required should be kept secret from all who were not, by previous instruction, disposed to make a right use of their knowledge; But, as the Philosophy of the Antients* was a kind of *Encyclopædia*, there were some also of which

* See Cic. de Trin. lib. v. c. 4.

268 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

which it would be ridiculous to pretend that the Philosophers concealed them for fear of exposing themselves to the Religious rage of the Populace ; such as those pretended Mysteries which *Lucian* facetiously exposes in his (q) *Auction of Lives* ; how long a Fly can live ; how deep the Sun's rays penetrate into the sea ; what kind of soul an Oyster has, &c. And let no body imagine, that this was only a jest of *Lucian* upon the *Esoteric Philosophy*. *Gellius* tells us that the *Exoteric* lessons were only about Rhetoric, Logic and Politics ; and those Lessons were given by *Aristotle* in the afternoon, to any young Man that would come and walk with him ; whereas in the *Acroamatic* or *Esoteric* ones, which were given in the morning, to such only as were his Disciples, that Philosopher discoursed of *the more remote and more subtile Philosophy, of Natural Philosophy, and of Metaphysics* ; for it seems the word *Dialectic* must be thus understood in this place. Thus the *Esoteric* and *Exoteric* Doctrines were so far from being destructive of one another, by *Gellius's* account, that they had not even the same object. *Clemens Alexandrinus* goes further than *Gellius* ; for his (r) expressions seem to imply that, at least in the *Peripatetic* School, the *Esoteric* Discipline was concerned in Physical questions only,

(q) *Lucian. Op. p. 198.*

(r) See *ubi sup. p.*

only, but not in Theological ones. Cicero gives a different account. According to him, the *supreme good* was the Object of both Disciplines, in that School; but that Subject was so far from being handled in a contradictory manner, that the *Esoteric* Doctrine was a Commentary upon, and an explanation of the *Exoteric* Lessons. (s) *As there is two kinds of Books written by the Peripateticians upon the supreme Good, says he, the one in a popular manner, which they call EXOTERIC, the other with greater accuracy which they have left in their Commentaries, they do not seem always to say the same thing in both, yet, in the mean, there is no diversity or dissention between them.* Toland has quoted the beginning of this passage, but suppressed the latter part of it which shews that the contradiction or diversity was not real, but only apparent. However, we may collect from these several accounts, that the subjects treated of in the *Esoteric* and *Exoteric* ways were partly the same and partly different; and as there could be no clashing between the two Disciplines, about the points which were the Objects of one of them only, so it is evident that, at least in that respect, the secret of the *Esoteric* was not introduced in order to conceal from the Public a scandalous difference between profession

(s) *Cic. de Fin. v. 5. Nec in summa tamen ipsa varietas est ulla.*

270 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

feſſion and belief. As for the points which were the Object of both, it is very eaſy to conceive how they could be ſpoken to in a different, without being treated in an oppoſite and contradictory manner. A general and a figurative way are different from, but not oppoſite to a particular and a proper one. Thus Chriſt may be ſaid to have had an *Exoteric* and an *Eſoteric* Doctrine; for tho' he ſpoke of the Kingdom of God, both in public to the *Jews*, and in private to his Diſciples; to the latter only *it was given to know the Myſteries* of that Kingdom, which were ſpoken to the Multitude only *in parables, that ſeeing they might not ſee, and hearing they might not underſtand*. But it is pretended this was not the caſe of the Philoſophers; and ſeveral inſtances are brought in to prove, that, on the Head of Religion, their *Exoteric* and *Eſoteric* Tenets were contradictory to one another. It is juſt to examine them.

The firſt inſtance brought by *Toland* is that of *Parmenides*, about which I refer the Reader to (t) Mr. *La Chapelle*, and ſhall content myſelf with obſerving, that (u) the words of *Philoponus* quoted in the *Clidophorus* have not the leaſt relation to the diſtinction we are ſpeaking of, and ought to be tranſlated thus, (w) *Parmenides reckons this among*

(t) *Bibl. Angl. ubi ſup.* (u) See *Clidoph. p. 70. §. 3.* (w) *Ap. Aldobr. Not. in Laert. ix. 22.*

among the Tenets founded upon opinion only, that fire and earth are the principle of all things; and this among the Tenets grounded on truth, that the Universe is one, finite, and unmoveable *αὐτὸν τὸν*. There is not a word of the Eternity or Incorruptibility of the Universe. The next instance is a very odd one. It is taken from things which were not kept from the sight or hearing of the Multitude; but exposed to public view, as the *Sphynxes* placed before most of the Egyptian Temples, or the inscriptions written on the very doors of the Fanes. For my part I don't understand how things exposed to public view can be instances of what was discovered to the initiated only, and I would rather look upon the inscriptions as very broad hints given to the Vulgar, that they ought to consider all that was either seen or done in the Temples as allegorical and mysterious: that *Isis*, for example, was not to be considered only as an ancient Queen of Egypt, but also as a symbol of Nature, which was the true and original Author of those advantages which *Isis* had taught her Subjects to avail themselves of. Thus they may serve as a proof, to confirm what I have said more than once, that the *Exoteric* or exterior instructions, (for I hope one may be allowed so to call what was to be met with on the outside of the Temples) were far from being irreconcilable with the *Esoteric* or interior Doctrine.

The

The third and last instance which I shall take notice of, for I pass over all that proves only the being of a double Doctrine, as foreign to our inquiry, is that of *Plato*, who (x) *speaks positively of a Creation; and yet says Toland, he's affirm'd by PHURNUTUS to have maintained the UNIVERSE to be JOVE.* Let the fact stand thus! Besides it is not said that one of these Doctrines was *Exoteric* and the other *Esoteric*, where is the contradiction? Who is ignorant that *Jove* was not *Plato's* supreme God, who had no name, but a created God?

As I am sensible that this Dissertation is running into an immoderate length, I will forbear mentioning what *Toland* has on the *Pythagoreans* disbelief of a future state, notwithstanding their *Exoterical* Doctrine of the *Metempsychosis*. The question is curious; but besides it does not properly belong to our inquiry, which must be confined to the *Philosopher's* opinions concerning the *Object of Worship*, it would carry us too far out of our way, as we could not avoid, at least, taking a survey of the many learned *Observations* of *Mr. Warburton* on that subject. Yet we cannot leave unexamined two of that able *Writer's* arguments that are brought to support the *System* we have hitherto endeavoured to confute.

The first is taken from the manner in which

(x) *Clidoph. §. 5. p. 75.*

which most Philosophers have spoken of several things which are looked upon as belonging to the essence of the National Religions. (y) *No one, says he, the least conversant in Antiquity will take it into his head that these Sages did not see the gross errors of the National Religions: All their writings being full of the absurdities of them.* The literal sense of the Poetical accounts of the Gods were certainly very absurd, and the Philosophers did often declare their dislike of them. But these declarations were no way part of their *Esoteric* Doctrine. They made them publicly, and I appeal, for the proof of this, to *Plato's* books of *Laws*, which *Mr. W.* reckons among those of the *Exoteric* kind. Again that sense of the Poetical accounts which the Philosophers rejected as absurd, viz. the literal sense, has never been looked upon by the Pagans as essential to their Religion. Provided the Objects of public Worship were acknowledged as worthy of that Worship, no matter upon what account; and the accounts which ancient Tradition had given of them received as containing truth, no matter whether literal or metaphorical truth, the National Religion was entire. But here generally lies the mistake. The Philosophers dislike of the literal interpretation of the Fables is mistaken for their rejecting the Fables themselves, which

(y) *Div. Leg.* p. 308.

274 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

which they never did ; or, if some of them did, it was rather in the *Exoteric* than in the *Esoteric* way. This is the only explanation of the riddle proposed by *Eusebius* speaking of *Plato*. (z) *Hear him*, says he, *one while rejecting, and another while again adopting the Fables* : He adopted them as Apologues or Parables : He rejected them as Histories. If people would insist upon viewing them in this last light ; it was better to lay them aside ; but if People would allegorize them, they not only might, but some ought to be retained. For to say with *Mr. Warb*, that *Plato* *exoterically* adopted the Fables, is contrary to fact, since the strongest things he has ever said against them are to be found in those Books which undoubtedly were of the *Exoteric* kind ; and therefore to say that he rejected them *esoterically* is a groundless assertion. But more of this by and by. I have nothing to say to what the same Author affirms of the Philosophers Doctrine, that it was lawful to tell lies for the Public good, only that (a) he quotes but a single passage to prove that this Doctrine was extended to the article we are upon ; and that passage has not a single word of *lying for the Public Good* ; *Macrobius* says that Philosophers do not make use of Fables or Allegories, in treating of all sorts of Subjects ; but only when

(z) See Warburt. Div. Leg. p. 352.

(a) Ibid. p. 310. See Macrobi. in somn. Scrip. i. 2.

when they speak either of the Soul or of Aerial and other Deities. What is that to professing one Religion and believing another? Does not *Macrobius* positively declare, that the Fables, (b) or rather fabulous Narrations, made use of by Philosophers, *have their foundation in truth*, and are nothing but *an exposition of the Truth, by something composed and feigned for that purpose*? He affirms that, not only of the Philosophers, but even of the Poets, and of the very Theogonists *Hesiod* and *Orpheus*; yet he tells us there was a difference between the Poetical and the Philosophical Allegories. The Passage is worth relating, because it affords us, I think, a better Key to the Doctrine of the Philosophers concerning Fables, than any quoted by *Toland*. “ When the Subject spoken
“ of is true, and the Narration only is
“ fabulous, there is more than one way to
“ relate what is true by the means of fictions; for the Narration may be so contrived as to contain shameful and monstrous accounts, quite unworthy of the
“ Gods; as Gods guilty of Adultery; *Saturn* castrating his Father *Cælus*, or put
“ in prison by his own Son who takes the
“ Empire from him. The Philosophers
“ chuse not to meddle with that kind of
“ Fables. Again the knowledge of Sacred Things

(b) Hoc jam vocatur fabulosa narratio non fabula.

276 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

“ Things may be declared under the veil of
 “ Fictions, so as to be wrapt up in decent
 “ stories and covered with honourable words,
 “ and this is the only kind of Fiction which
 “ a prudent Philosophy admits of, in treating
 “ of Divine Things.” *Macrobius* here un-
 ravelles the whole Mystery, and sets the Phi-
 losophers opinion about those poetical Fa-
 bles which contained obscene or ridiculous
 accounts of the Gods, in a very clear light.
 They admitted them as containing Truth,
 but they openly testified their dislike of the
 dress in which the Poets had made that
 Truth appear.

The second Argument of Mr. *W.* which
 I must take notice of, is grounded upon a
 passage of *Plato* which that learned Man must
 have read when his mind was so strongly pre-
 possessed in favour of a favourite Notion he
 had embraced, that he saw that Notion every-
 where; for he represents it quite different
 from what it is in reality. *Plato*, says he (e)
 “ in his books of Laws, which were of the
 “ *Exoteric* kind, defends the popular Opi-
 “ nion which held the Sun, Moon, Stars,
 “ and Earth to be Gods Yet in his
 “ *Cratylus*, which was of the *Esoteric* kind,
 “ he laughs at the Antients for worshipping
 “ the Sun and Stars as Gods.” The first
 thing I shall observe here is, that the assertion
 of the *Cratylus* belonging to the *Esoteric*
 kind

kind is a very precarious one. Mr. *W.* appeals to *Albinus*, an old Platonist, to prove that *Plato's Criton, Phædo, Minos, Symposium, Laws, Epistles, Epinomis, Menexenus, Glitophon*, and *Philebus* were ranked among the *Exoteric Books*; and gives no special reason for ranking either the *Cratylus* or any other book among the *Esoteric* ones; whereby we are left to conclude that, according to him, all the books which are not put by *Albinus* in the same Class with the ten before-mentioned were *Esoteric*. Now *Albinus* does not divide *Plato's* works into *Esoteric* and *Exoteric*; (c) but makes eight Classes of them. The ten books before-mentioned make up the fifth Class, which he calls *Political*. The *Cratylus* is ranked among the books of *Logic*; and it is to be observed that it treats particularly of *Grammar*, which made a part of the Antient's *Logic*; but why we should look on it as an *Esoteric* performance, is what I am not able to guess. If *Albinus* must be our guide, there is no Dialogue of *Plato* that has a better title to be called *Esoteric*, than the *Timæus* of which he speaks thus. (d) *Whereas the virtuous Man must acquire as extensive a knowledge as he can of Divine Things, in order to conform himself to the Gods; let us read the Timæus, for there we shall find the natural History and Theology, together with an*

N

account

(c) *Albini* introd. in *Plat.* cap. 5. *Ap. Fab. B. G. T.* ii. p. 46.

(d) *Ibid* cap. 8.

278 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

account of the formation of the Universe, and thus rightly (e) remember what concerns Divinity. But what is the Doctrine delivered in that Dialogue? It is a Doctrine as agreeable to the popular Theology, as the thoughts of a learned sublime-minded Man can ever be to the Tenets of a thoughtless Multitude. There is one eternal God, and several created Gods: The World is God; The Sun, the Moon, and all the Stars are Gods, whose being and Deity are known by Contemplation and Philosophy. There are other Gods whose Genealogy and History can be known only from Revelation. The accounts they have given of themselves must be credited. Whatever the supreme God has created by himself is immortal and God. The Souls of Men are in the number of those immediate productions of the first Being; and those only are subject to go after death into the bodies of women, birds, quadrupedes, reptiles or fishes, that have been tainted with some vice or imperfection during their abode in a Man's body; of which a plain consequence is, that such Souls as are not thus debased, are reintegrated into the nature and prerogatives of Godhead. All Gods and Goddesses must be prayed to. This is a faithful abstract of the Doctrine delivered in the *Timæus*, and which, if *Albinus* be right,

we

(e) 'Αναμνησκόμεν. This is according to the Platonic Doctrine, which held all learning to be reminiscence.

we must take for the genuine, or *Esoteric* Theology of *Plato*.

But since Mr. *W.* appeals to the *Cratylus*, as ridiculing that very Theology, let us see what is contained in that Dialogue, the design of which is to examine whether the words are arbitrary denominations, or expressions of the nature of things. For my part I find the place, tho' not particularly quoted, where the opinion of the Antients concerning the Deity of the Sun, Moon, and Stars is mentioned; but I don't see that *Plato* laughs at them for worshipping those Gods. Far from it. He supposes, both there and all along, that the established Religion is right: and endeavours to account for the names given to each God, from those very Attributes whereby they were the most remarkable in the popular Theology. He affirms that what seems (*f*) an *affront* offered to *Jupiter*, in the Poetical accounts. is really *very reasonable*, if rightly understood; he makes *Socrates* expressly declare for (*g*) *mysteries*, or things which may be understood by the Gods, and taught by the Poets their Interpreters, tho' beyond the reach of human understanding; which I remark purposely against *Collins*; he teaches that the *Dæmons* are those dead men who, after lead-

N 2

ing

(*f*) *Cratyl.* p. 397.

(*g*) *Τερισμῶν . . . δόξαι . . . ἑυλογου δέ*, p. 396.

(*b*) P. 392. See *Collins D. of Free-thinking*, p. 125.

ing a wise and virtuous life, have been admitted into a state of perfect happiness and (i) high dignity. I don't know what the Accusers of the antient Sages can say to this, but for my part, I am very willing to look on these Tenets as part of their *Esoteric* Doctrine.

Hitherto we have chiefly considered those arguments which have induced others to think that the *Esoteric* Doctrine of the Philosophers was contrary to the *Exoteric*. Now we must add to what we have already said upon that subject, some special reasons which persuade us that the two Doctrines were only different, without being opposite.

The first then is taken from the behaviour of the Philosophers when Christianity came to be the Religion, not of the Multitude only, but even of the State. Had they been of opinion that no God but one has a right to be worshipped by Men, or that any Religion which is established by Law may be safely complied with outwardly, tho' one condemns it in his heart; no reason can be imagined why they should not have conformed to what had been regulated by *Constantine*. Supposing their *Esoteric* discipline consisted in teaching the unity of God, in such a manner as to discover the *delusion of Polytheism*, no Religion in the world came nearer to that discipline than ours; and consequently

(i) Μεγάλην μοῖραν καὶ τιμὴν. P. 398.

quently they must have had a sort of predilection for it. But in fact, they attacked it with all their might. The consequence is obvious.

Our second reason is taken from the silence of the primitive Christians. Several of them had been instructed in the Schools of the Philosophers. Some had even been Teachers, and therefore it is not to be supposed that any of the most secret Tenets could be unknown to them. Yet we don't see that any of them even told the Pagans that their Religion was rejected by the Philosophers, when, the Crowd being removed, they were among their friends and disciples. Whoever has read the Apologies published in favour of Christianity, during the three or four former ages of our *Æra*, must be convinced that the Fathers would not have failed expatiating upon such a reproach, had there been any foundation for it in fact, and therefore their silence is a proof that there was none.

Lastly, we may consider *Clemens Alexandrinus* as something more than a negative Evidence. That Father, who spoke (k) of the distinction between the *Esoteric* and the *Exoteric* Doctrine more than any other ancient Author, is so far from considering that

N 3

distribution.

(k) Clem. Strom. lib. v.

distribution as introduced thro' hypocrisy and dissimulation, that he compares it with the method used by the Prophets and Apostles, who had concealed part of the wholesome Doctrine under Enigmas and Allegories, and revealed part of it only to the Multitude. It cannot be pretended that *Clemens* looked on the Apostles and Prophets as Hypocrites and Time-servers, and consequently he cannot have considered the Philosophers in that light neither.

Before we leave this subject, it must be observed, that, as far as we are able to judge of that matter, by what is remaining of ancient monuments, the distinction between the *Exoteric* and *Esoteric* Doctrine ceased when Christianity became common in the World. As the most learned Pagans were then obliged to make use of the best arms their Systems could afford, to defend their Religion against the attacks of the Christians, the secret could be kept no longer: and we see that the Authors who speak of that distinction, after Christ, talk of it as of a thing that had been, but not then actually existing.

The case of the Philosophers initiation to the Mysteries.

The light in which the Mysteries of Paganism are generally viewed would not afford an argument to support the charge of Hypocrisy

pocrisy brought against the Philosophers who were initiated to them ; but if the Notion which Mr. Warburton gives of those sacred Ceremonies be right, no person who, after being initiated, continued an Idolater can be excused from that dissimulation, which we think the earliest as well as the latest Pagan Philosophers were entirely innocent of. This makes it necessary for us to inquire into that matter. The System of that learned Man upon this subject may be reduced to the three following Propositions.

I. The mean design of the Mysteries was to enforce the Doctrine of Providence, in order to encourage Men to the practice of virtue, and deter them from vice.

II. To this end the Institutors of these sacred Rites, who were Lawgivers, and Founders of Civil Government as well as of Religion, thought it necessary to inculcate the Doctrine of a Future State.

III. They also thought it adviseable to teach the Doctrine of the unity of God, and to discover the *delusion of Polytheism*, in order to remedy those evils which attended the vulgar Notion of the Gods, as represented by the Poets.

Mr. Warburton has, in my opinion, fully proved the two former Propositions ; but the passages of the Antients he alledges to support the third, seem to me insufficient to prove it, and rather fit to establish a Thesis

equally suitable to that Author's general scope, yet very different from what he affirms. This is what we shall endeavour to make good by a few observations.

I. We must carefully distinguish between teaching the Unity of God, that is to say, the unity of the original Cause of all Things and supreme Governor of the Universe, to whom all other Beings owe their existence and must obey, and teaching the Unity of the Object of worship. The first of these Doctrines was taught in the Mysteries: I grant it: But as to the second, which alone could imply that Polytheism was a *delusion*, there is not a single word in the Antients, of its having been mentioned in the Mysteries, except it was to reject it. The great *Cudworth*, who is appealed to, as having (1) made very evident that the *Egyptian Mystagogues in their secret Rites taught the unity of the Godhead*, made it very evident also that the Pagan, and especially the *Egyptian*, Polytheism was no way inconsistent with the Doctrine of Unity: the *one self-existent God* being set in opposition to *many self-existent*, not to *many created Deities*.

II. We are not to suppose that the Legislators willingly overthrew, without some weighty reasons, the whole System of the National Religions, (m) which was in a great measure

(1) Div. leg. p. 150.

(m) Div. Leg. p. 97, 101, 131, 13. &c.

measure their own building ; a building upon the stability of which it is allowed they thought the safety of the State greatly depended. But there is no reason given, why they should have established the Unity of God, in the Mysteries, in opposition to the plurality of Objects of Worship ; for the end it is said they propos'd in so doing might be as well, if not better, attained, by a method more agreeable to the rest of the Legislators behaviour with regard to Religion, and altogether better suited to the genius of the sacred Ceremonies we are upon. The end of the Mysteries was to establish (n) *the Belief of a Providence and future State, and its consequence on practice ; engagements to a virtuous life. But there was one insuperable obstacle in Paganism to a life of purity and holiness ; which was the vicious examples of their Gods.*—There was a necessity then of remedying this evil, which was done by striking at the root of it ; so that such of the Initiated as were judged capable were made acquainted with the whole delusion The fabulous Gods being thus routed, the Supreme Cause of all things, of course, took their place The obligation to a good life taught in the lesser Mysteries made it necessary to remove the errors of Polytheism in the greater. I am afraid the ambiguity of the words *errors of Polytheism* has induced Mr.

N 5

W. into

(n) Ib. p. 148.

286 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

W. into a great mistake. We Christians rank the very being of the many Gods adored by the Gentiles, and the Worship paid to them, among the errors of Polytheism : But it is not proved, to say nothing more, that the antient Sages ever did so : and they acted agreeably to their principles not to ours. The errors of Polytheism were to them nothing else but the ridiculous stories resulting from the literal interpretation of the Fables ; and consequently there was no necessity of removing any thing besides that interpretation, as *(o)* *they were only these stories, that, in their opinion, made Polytheism hurtful to the State.* Thus allegorizing the Fables, and teaching that the Gods were not really guilty of the crimes they seemed to be charged with in the Poetical accounts of them, fully answered the proposed ends, *viz.* to clear the moral character of the Deity from all imputation of vice.

III. We must not let it pass unobserved, that, supposing with Mr. *W.* that the end sought for by the Legislators, in establishing National worship and Religious Mysteries, was utility and not truth, they had very strong reasons to give the preference to that method which kept the credit of the established worship entire, over that whereby the Gods who were publickly adored would have

(o) Ibid. p. 150.

have been secretly routed and defeated. I shall touch but two.

1. *The Institutors of the Mysteries, who were Legislators, had had the greatest share in the rise of Polytheism. They contrived it for the sake of the State, and to keep the People in awe under a greater veneration for their Laws.* But what became of that veneration if they pulled down with one hand what they so wisely, as they thought, had raised with the other? The belief of many Gods was or was not, in their opinion, useful to the State. If it was, they must have supported it, and vindicated it from objections, by allegorizing the Fables. If it was not, they must never have meddled with it to give it credit, as it is allowed they did.

2. It is certain that the oaths had been introduced by the Legislators for the good of Society; and that their use wholly depended upon the acknowledgment of those Gods who were called upon, to witness the truth and honesty of the Swearer, or to punish his falsehood and treachery. But, if Mr. W's notion of the Mysteries be right, the Legislators themselves destroyed, in the Initiated, that awe of (p) the Gods sworn by, which they looked upon as one of the surest foundations of public tranquillity.

IV. The nature and design of the Mysteries

(p) See *Potter's Archæolog.* ii. 6. & *Div. Log.* P 259.

288 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

steries seem to have required that the Fables should rather be allegorized than thrown out, and the national Gods rather recommended than discredited.

And first, as to the nature of them, allegory was extremely well suited to it. They were a kind of Theatrical Drama, partly intended for propagating or inculcating the Doctrine of a *future State*. But how was that Doctrine taught? It was not in grave discourses, and sedate arguments. It was by shews and representations of Men either miserable or happy, in Hell and Elysium, according as they had led a virtuous or a vicious life. This Mr. *W.* has made out so as not to be easily contradicted. But as we are told in a passage of *Cicero*, which has been quoted before, that no body imagined there was really such things as were generally spoken of concerning Hell; we must suppose the Initiated were cautioned to take in an allegorical sense whatever was there exposed to their sight. *Theodore** acknowledges that the obscene objects which were there exposed to the eyes of the Spectators were *Ænigmas* or Emblems, and *Dion Chrysostom* calls the whole a *Mystic Spectacle* *μυστικὴ θεαματὴ*. But if they were taught by the *Mythagogue*, that tho' there had really been a *Tantalus* and an *Ixion*

* *Theod. & D. Chryf. ap. Meurs. Eleusin. c. xi*
P. 31, 33.

Ixion, yet the wheel of the one and the unapproachable apple of the other, were only allegories, designed to represent the state of misery which their wickedness had brought them to after their death : It seems very reasonable also to think, that when the History of the Gods, to whom the Mysteries were consecrated, came to be represented, as described by the Poets, the Initiated were told by the Hierophantes, that such or such particular of the Fable signified, that the Hero or God, celebrated in the Drama, had conferred such or such benefit upon Mankind, or upon his Country.

I say the Hero or God ; for it is very remarkable that no Gods had Mysteries consecrated to them, but such as were known to have been Men ; and the mysterious shews were (q) a secret worship paid to the Patron Gods of the Place where they had been at first instituted ; to the Mother of the Gods in *Samothrace* ; to *Isis* and *Osiris* in *Egypt* ; to *Bacchus* in *Boeotia*, to *Ceres* and *Proserpine* at *Athens*, to *Venus* in *Cyprus*, to *Castor* and *Pollux* at *Amphissa*, and so to others in other Places. Now I cannot understand, how a secret Worship could be paid to those several Gods, by teaching that they were not Gods. I don't understand neither, how the Mysteries could be different in different

rent Places, as it is allowed they were; if they did every where consist in discovering the delusion of Polytheism, that is to say, in teaching that there is but one lawful Object of Worship, and that all those Gods, who were adored according to law, were but inventions of Men.

Secondly, if we do attend to the end proposed by the Mysteries, we shall find it did likewise require that the National and other Gods should hold their posts. This end was to enforce the belief of a Providence, in order to encourage Men to a virtuous life, by the prospect of a future happy State. But the Doctrine of Providence always was, and is still, obscured by many objections arising from moral and natural evil. Therefore it was natural for the Institutors of the Mysteries, to fix upon that System which was the less exposed to such objections. Now the System of Polytheism was extremely convenient to get rid of them. A Providence administered by the means of created and finite, tho' immortal Beings, who were not supposed to be possessed of all the perfections which characterise the supreme God, and some of whom, tho' much superior to Men, were supposed subject (r) to human passions, agreed well enough with those defects or *anomalies*, which we can so little account

(r) *Apul. de Deo Socrat. p. 684. Iisdem quibus nos perturbationibus mentis obnoxii,*

account for, in the System of a Providence administred by the supreme God immediately.

As to the end of encouraging virtue, and chiefly that kind of virtue which was the most for the service of the Public, nothing was better accommodated to it than the Mysteries, if, after representing the wicked as miserable in Hell, and the virtuous Men as happy in Elysium, they exposed to the eyes of the Initiated the transcendent felicity and Deification of those who had been eminently virtuous, and serviceable to their Country. But on the other hand, the Mysteries woud have been in some measure a discouragement to Heroism, if they had reduced to bare mortal Men those who were looked upon as having been admitted among the Gods, on account of their heroic actions. Thus we may see why the Initiated were told, that the Objects of public Worship had been Men, as it is certain by many passages of the Antients they were; for, had they been Gods by nature, they could have given no examples, and their actual Deity could be no encouragement to virtue. But pulling them down from the Divine Throne public opinion had raised them to, for that very reason that they were originally Men, woud have been actually defeating the end of the Mysteries, by destroying the noblest part of the System of a future State.

V. We

V. We have given our Reasons for not being of opinion that the Unity of God was mentioned in the Myſteries in oppoſition to Polytheiſm. But one will ſay, why then was it mentioned at all? I don't remember to have read any paſſage of the Antients where the reaſon is given; but the very nature of the thing ſufficiently points it out. The Doctrine of Providence was to be made as plain, as eaſy, and of as great an influence as poſſible upon Men's morals. Polytheiſm removed the objections taken from the apparent irregularities in the Government of the World; but as long as it was not linked together with the Doctrine of a ſupreme Governor over the whole, it admitted of many difficulties. How could the greateſt general good be procured? How could the beſt end be conſtantly purſued, if the World was governed by ſeveral independent Gods, who, being ſubject to paſſions, had neceſſarily ſeparated intereſts? But, above all, how could it be certain that virtue alone would bring Men to the higheſt degree of happineſs, while the whole diſpoſal of all things was entirely left to a ſet of Gods, ſome of whom might be influenced by paſſions and caprice? To give a reaſonable certainty on that point, and remedy all inconveniencies, it was neceſſary to acknowledge a ſupreme Ruler, who might ſuffer his Miniſters to deviate from the beſt rules in ſome particular caſes,

cases, but would be sure, at last, to set every thing right; upon whose righteous determination the decisive and lasting fate of every Man entirely depended; and without whose particular consent no one could ascend to that degree of happiness and power, which was enjoyed by the Gods. It may be added, that, as the Mysteries were consecrated to the Patron-Gods, or Gods whose particular care was the superintendence as well as protection of some particular Countries, it was analogical to give a Patron God to the Universe, that the parts should not appear to have fared better than the whole; and to this *Plutarch* seems to allude in the following words quoted by *Mr. Warb.* It was a Doctrine taught in the Mysteries; (s) *that the Universe is not upheld fortuitously, without mind, reason, or a Governor to preside over its Revolutions.*

VI. The notion I give of the Mysteries, as of a Drama wherein the Doctrine of one supreme Self-existent God was brought in as a supplement to the vulgar Theology, and the right of the other Deities, especially of the Patron Gods, to the worship paid to them according to the laws of the Land, asserted from their being Men preferred to Godhead on account of their virtuous Life, is agreeable to whatever the Antients have told us concerning that matter. Among the many

(s) See Div. Leg. p. 181.

294 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

many passages quoted by Mr. *W.* I find but two capable of a construction contrary to this affirmation. The first is that celebrated saying of *Varro* preserved by *St. Austin*, (1) *that many things are true, which not only are not fit for the Vulgar to know; but even if they should be false, it's fit the Vulgar should think otherwise: and that therefore the Greeks kept their initiations and Mysteries in secrecy and within private walls.* This is a translation of *Varro's* words by *Dr. Bentley*, who, I hope, will be allowed to have understood *Latin*. Mr. *W.* translates instead of *but even if, &c. and many things which, tho' false, it was expedient the people should believe*, and his *Latin* in the margin answers that translation; *multaque, quæ tametsi falsa sint, &c.* But when the original is consulted, these words *multaque quæ*, are no more to be found there than the *et quædam*, and *some things* which *Collins* had inserted in the same place. This observation is not as trifling as at first sight it might appear; for thereby we see that *Varro* did not speak of two different kinds of things, the one true, and the other false. He talks of one sort of things only, of which

(1) *Multa esse vera quæ non modo vulgo scire non fit utile; sed etiam tametsi falsa sint, [some edit. have sunt] aliter existimare populum expediat, et ideo Græcos Teletas et Mystéria taciturnitate parietibus quæ clausisse. Aug. de civ. D. iv. 31. Warb. Div. Leg. p. 144. Bentley's Phil. Lips. part. ii. p. 60. Collins disc. of Freethinking, p. 134.*

which he declares, 1st. his opinion that they are true. Then says Dr. Bentley, that tho' they should be false (not that he says they are false) the people ought not to know it. Thus Varro speaks of true things revealed to the Initiated, and concealed from the Vulgar, not of cheats and impostures unmasked; tho' he confesses that the same secret is observed, with respect to those true things, as if they were false, and their falsity politically kept from the knowledge of the Vulgar. He says that these truths are different from, but has not a word of their being opposed, to the notions of the Vulgar.

The second passage is taken from *Clemens Alexandrinus's* exhortation to the Gentiles. That Author really seems to find a contradiction between the beginning of the Mysteries, wherein (x) the whole Theology of Idols was explained, and the conclusion, wherein the Unity of the first Principle and supreme God was taught. He calls that latter part of the Mysteriorious hymn, a *pali-nody* or recantation of the former; but it must be observed that he does not impute to the Hierophantes, that he looks upon that Doctrine of the Unity as a recantation of the Plurality. He only pretends that it is one in the nature of the thing; but we may very well conclude it

(x) *Clem. Al. protrept.* p. 63. Μετὰ τὴν τῶν ὀργάνων
ιεροφαντίαν, καὶ τῶν εἰδώλων τὴν Θεολογίαν, ταχυρῶς ἀλη-
θείας εἰσάγει.

296 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

it was not so in the opinion of the initiated Pagans, from the manner in which *Clemens* himself speaks of the Mysteries, in that part of the same book where he purposely treats that subject. He represents them as (y) *the seed of wickedness and corruption.* (z) *The Mysteries instituted by Draco,* says he, *are a kind of seduction,* and after giving a most odious picture of the several Mysteries, as celebrated in different Places, he concludes thus. *These are the Mysteries of the Atheists; for I may justly call Atheists Men who have no knowledge of the true God, and are not ashamed to adore a Boy torn to pieces by the Titans, a mournful Woman, and those parts of the body which are not to be named. They are guilty of a double Atheism; first because they don't acknowledge the truly existing God, secondly because (a) they are seduced into a belief that these still exist and are Gods, who have no real being, nay no being at all but that of their names.* It is plain from this passage, first, that, in *Clemens's* opinion, the knowledge of the true God and the worship of the false ones were things reciprocally destructive of one another; but it does not follow that they were so in the judgment of the *Gentiles*; 2dly, That the Mysteries taught

(y) Ib. p. 13. Σπέρμα κακίας καὶ φθορᾶς . . . τὰ μυστήρια.

(z) Ib. p. 19. Καὶ τοῦ δράκοντος τὰ μυστήρια ἀπάτη τις ἐστίν.

(a) Ibid. p. 20. Θεοὺς τῆς τοῦτον ὀνομάζοντες τοὺς οὐκ ὄντας, ὄντας μᾶλλον δὲ ὡς οὐκ ὄντας.

taught to worship as still existing after death, and being Gods, Men whom *Clemens*, (agreeably to an error common to several of the Fathers, viz. that the punishment of the Wicked and Infidels consisted in the extinction of their Souls) looked upon as annihilated.

From *Clemens's* account, let us come to the opinion which was generally entertained of the Mysteries by the primitive Christians. Several Philosophers, and many no doubt who had been initiated, became Converts, so that the secret of the mysterious Ceremonies was probably divulged; and, was there no other proof of it, the numberless particulars mentioned by *Clemens* shew that it had been betrayed. Thus the Christians at that time must have had a right notion of them. Yet their notion does not agree with that of Mr. *W.*, for had the delusion of Polytheism been detected in the Mysteries, they could not but have been looked on by the Christians, as a kind of preparation to Christianity, towards which the first step, for a Heathen, was to acknowledge that the Idols of the Nations are vanity, to abjure the National Gods, and to own that there is but one true Object for Religious worship. Thus the Christians must have esteemed them; and spoken of them and their Institutors with as much respect, at least, as they did of the Sibyls and
their

298 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

their pretended Oracles. But, instead of that, we find them all as great despisers of those institutions as *Clemens Alexandrinus*.

Again; if the Unity of God was taught in the Mysteries in opposition to Polytheism, the Propagators and Defenders of Christianity had nothing to do with that Doctrine but to tell the Heathen: our Religion teaches nothing concerning your Gods, but what is declared in your own Mysteries, *viz.* That, as they are dead Men, they have no title to our Adoration; they are no fit Objects for Religious worship. But, instead of that, we see the Christians incessantly busying themselves in proving what, according to Mr. *W*'s System, there was no occasion for proving, since it was granted and even inculcated by the Hierophantes in the most August Ceremonies of the Heathenish Religion. The consequence to be inferred from these reflexions is so obvious, that I need not dwell on them any longer.

To the judgment passed upon the Mysteries by the Christians, we may add the condemnation passed upon the Christians in the Mysteries. No Religion can more strictly adhere to the principle of Unity, as opposed to the worship of many Gods, than ours: and therefore it was natural, as soon as Christianity came to be known in the World, that its Followers should be looked upon as initiated

initiated, if the end and consummation of the initiation was to teach that Doctrine, and to represent it in that light. But instead of that favourable reception, Christianity met with a dreadful one from the Overseers of the Mysteries. A *caveat* was entered against them at the Door; lest they should be admitted; and an apartment immediately prepared for them in *Tartarus*, as Mr. W. rightly (b) concludes it from a passage of *Celsus*: And under what pretence? Because they were looked on in the same light as the Atheists and Epicureans. (c) *If any Atheist, or Christian, or Epicurean be here; let him be expelled*, was the proclamation copied from the Eleusinian Mysteries, by the Impostor *Alexander*, if any faith be had to *Lucian*. Now the Christians were Atheists in no respect but that of their opposing the Unity of one supreme God to the worship of many subordinate Deities; and therefore the formal exclusion here given them, and the punishments supposed to be inflicted on them in *Tartarus*, on account of their Atheism, were equivalent to a declaration, that the two Doctrines of one God above all, and many Gods Objects of worship, ought not to be considered as destructive of one another.

There is a passage much to the same purpose in *Libanius*, tho' I must own

(b) *Div. Leg.* p. 171.

(c) *Luciani Pseudomantis.* p. 489.

it has been hitherto understood in a quite different sense. This Orator, talking of the Mysteries, says the Mystagogue requires from those who are to be initiated, that they should be (*d*) *Greeks in their Hands, in their Souls, in their Tongue or Speech*. As purity had been required immediately before, this is understood as if they should have washed their hands, purified their souls, and spoken true *Greek*. The learned *Fred. Morel*, *Casaubon*, *Meursius*, and Mr. *Warburton* himself have put no better construction on it; yet I wonder how they could reconcile it with the *Rhetor's* phrase, whereby it is evident that the *Hand* and the *Soul* were to be *Greek* as well as the *Tongue*. They might as well have said, that none could be initiated except he knew how to write *Greek* in a fair hand. For my part, I humbly conceive the abovementioned learned Men did not attend to the double signification of the word *Greeks* Ἕλληνες, both in *Libanius* and all other Authors of that age. If you make it signify *Heathen*; the request of the Mystagogue was a very proper one, at a time when, the Emperors being Christians, many might be Pagans in their souls, nay secret practisers of Idolatry, without being professed.

(*d*) *Lib. Declam. xix. p. 495. Τὰς χεῖρας, τὴν ψυχὴν, τὴν φωνὴν ἑλλήνας εἶναι. See Morel. interpret. Meursii Eleusinia. c. 10. p. 28. Warburt. Div. Leg. p. 180. & Casaub. quoted by him.*

professed Gentiles, or Greeks in their speech : and there can be no doubt but *Libanius* copies from the practice of his own time, what he says of the Mysteries. Now, if this interpretation be admitted, *Libanius* tells us, as well as *Lucian*, that, to be initiated to the Mysteries, one must be a thorough Pagan ; nay he goes farther than *Lucian*, for he adds Profession and Practice to Belief.

But whatever may be the fate of that conjecture, the main part of our System is confirmed by other passages of the Antients. (e) *We learn from Apuleius, that the supernal and infernal Gods passed in review*, says Mr. W., and this was done, that the Mystagogue might have an opportunity of singing to each of these an hymn which *Clemens* before cited calls the *Theology of Idols*. Now what was the meaning of this ceremony ? Was that hymn a commendation or a defamation of the Deities reviewed ? *Apuleius* positively says he (f) *adored those Gods as he approached them* ; which shews that it was rather a confirmation of, than a dissuasion from Polytheism. The protection which *Pericles* expected (g) *from the Eleusinian Goddesses*, on account of his initiation, persuades us the same thing, and it seems to be put past dispute

O by

(e) *Div. Leg.* p. 156.

(f) *Apul. Metam.* xi. p. 388. Deos inferos & Deos superos accessi coram, & adoravi de proximo.

(g) *Meurs. Eleus. ex Sopat.* p. 48. Περικλὲς ταῖς ἐν ἐλευσίν θεαῖς, &c.

by the Ancients telling us that the Mysteries contained such (*b*) instructions concerning not only the nature, but likewise the worship of the Gods, as left no doubt or ambiguity on those subject in the mind of the Initiated. Those of *Ceres* in particular, if we may depend upon *Pburnutus*(*i*) his Judgment, had been instituted to keep up a grateful remembrance of the invention of corn. From all that has been said upon this subject, I think we may safely conclude that the Philosophers in *Julian's* time, and *Julian* himself, being, like most of the Philosophers in antiquity, initiated to the most secret Mysteries of Paganism, is very far from being a proof, or even a presumption, that they were Hypocrites in their Profession of Heathenism.

Before I conclude, I must observe that, in all probability, the Mysteries were not exactly the same since Christianity had diffused itself into the world, as they had been in former times. They had degenerated into magic Operations, and were not distinct from what was then called Theurgy. *Jamblichus*, in his book of the
Mysteries

(*b*) *Arrian*. *ibid.* p. 12. Ἐπὶ ταύταις. *Etimol.* *ibid.* p. 13. τὰς θεῶν ἀνοῦσαι το ὁρθά. *Sopat.* ap. *Warburton* p. 182. Οὐδεὶς ἐπὶ τῶν περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ἔχει θρησκείαν ἀμφιέσθον. Mr. *Warburton* translates these last words *clearing up all doubts concerning the righteous government of the Gods*; but I suppose he did not attentively consider the passage, or else he would have remembered that θ. γὰρ αὐτῶν signifies *Worship* and not *Government*.

(*i*) *Phurn.* *de nat. Deor. de Cerere.* p. 80.

Mysteries, acknowledges but one Religious method, viz. Theurgy, for coming at a true knowledge of the Gods, and tells us (k) *this was the end or consummation of the sacred Initiation among the Egyptians*, from whom the Mysteries had descended to the Greeks. The introduction of Christianity was, if I am not mistaken, the occasion of this change. As secrecy was essential to the Mysterious Rites, when the vindication of the public Religion made it necessary to divulge the hidden doctrines, some other secret must have come in their stead. Therefore, instead of shewing the nature of the Gods by way of explanation of the spectacle, the Hierophantes pretended to shew the Gods themselves; and, to that purpose, to evocate the Deities by holy Rites and Ceremonies. Thus *Libanius* says that *Julian* (l) *had often conversed with the Demons in the Mysteries*; and *Apeulëius*, in the account he gives of his initiation, positively declares that he had been admitted into *the nearest presence of the Gods*; ACCESSICORAM ET ADORAVI DE PROXIMO. This subject might afford scope to a further disquisition, which I woud not be unwilling to enter into, had not this Dissertation already swelled to an immoderate size: But it may suffice to

O 2

observe

(k) Jambl. de Myst. Sect. x. cap. 5, 6.

(l) Ἐν ταύταις ἐνηλθέας δαίμονι. Fab. B. G. vii. p. 173.

304 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

observe, that this change made the Mysteries rather more Heathenish and more superstitious than before; and consequently it rather confirms than weakens what we have endeavoured to prove with regard to the Pagan Philosophers. Now let us come to the last ground of suspicion against their sincerity.

The Philosophers Apologies for Paganism.

The prepossession of our mind in favour of certain Tenets is such a byass upon our Judgment, with regard to every thing that bears a relation to them, that it is very hard to construe the weakness of men's arguments for error, into a proof that they are not sincere in the patronizing of it. We ought rather to consider that, from the very nature of things, error can never be supported but with bad arguments, and that, of course, men who are engaged in it, let them be ever so sincere, must necessarily make use of Sophisms. Yet this is the chief, if not the only support of F. La Bletterie's charge against the Philosophers in Julian's time. (m) *Their efforts*, says he, (in apologizing for Paganism) *did more honour to their wit than their sincerity*; and the only reason he gives for not thinking they were sincere, is that their arguments were not conclusive.

Was

Was I to follow the same method, I would say that no *Roman Catholic* Controversialist is sincere, as their Apologies for the Religious Worship they pay to several created Beings, Angels, Saints, Images, Relics, &c. seem to me not only insignificant, but even copied from the Apologies anciently offered in favour of Idolatry. The only point therefore to be inquired into is, whether the arguments brought by those who stand charged with hypocrisy contain any thing which they knew to be false. Then, indeed, the charge is good; but otherwise it must fall to the ground. To examine that matter, it will not be improper to divide their Apologies into several classes, and to consider

I. The Reasons they gave for adhering to their Religion taken in the lump, without entering into particulars. They did not fail to support it (n) by *Oracles and pretended prodigies, by popular Traditions erected into authentic facts; by the examples of so many ages and such various Nations, and in fine by the prosperity of the Romans, whose Conquests had sufficiently justified their Religion.* The Oracles and Prodigies are the only two articles in this list, with respect to which the Philosophers can be suspected of having disbelieved what they gave out for a foundation of their Religion. But even in
O 3 that

(n) Ibid.

that respect is the suspicion well grounded? Some, and perhaps the greatest part of the Prodigies appealed to, were matters of fact; and the mistake consisted only in assigning a wrong cause to effects that had been really produced, or making a wrong application of them. Other pretended miracles were attested by ancient Tradition, or recorded in monuments which were generally looked on as authentic, as *votary inscriptions, Decrees of the Senate made upon particular occasions, &c.* Now who can say that the Philosophers could not be mistaken, as well as the Populace, in the Judgment they passed upon some events that seemed a little to deviate from the ordinary course of nature, and have a sincere, tho' excessive, dependence upon the Traditions of their Ancestors: since in our Age, (when nature is better known, and the Science of Criticism carried much farther than it was then,) miracles both ancient and modern, of no better sort, have found, in the Church of *Rome*, Patrons of an unexceptionable sincerity? As for Oracles, it is probable they were mostly the product of fraud and fanaticism. But the Philosophers, and especially the latest *Platonists*, were no way proof against fanaticism, and might be imposed on by crafty Priests as easily as any of the *Vulgar*; considering the manner in which Oracles were usually uttered:

uttered: Besides it is observable that the Oracles appealed to by the Philosophers at *Julian's* time, and by *Julian* himself, were mostly, if not entirely, ancient ones; and consequently could not be supposed to have been forged by them for the support of their cause.

II. The reasons they gave for the worship of Images, and the same might serve for the worship of animals, plants, mountains, rivers, &c. were exactly the same which are made use of by the Roman-Catholics, as one may easily see by comparing the following account with the Catechism of the Council of *Trent*, and the writings of *Bellarmino* and other Controversialists. (o) *They said that the object of that worship was not the brass or the marble, but the God to whom the statue was consecrated; Being united to a portion of matter, it was necessary for us to have corporeal symbols which might receive an exterior worship, that pleased the Gods, because they knew the motive of it, as the Em-*

○ 4

perors

(o) *Ibid.* See *Jul.* fragment. p. 293. Ἀγάλματα γὰρ, καὶ βωμοὶ, καὶ πυροὶ ἀσβέστη Φυλακῶν, καὶ πάντα ἄλλως τὰ τοιαῦτα σύμβολα οἱ πατέρες ἔθεντο τῆς παρουσίας τῶν Θεῶν, οὐχ ἵνα ἐκεῖνα θεοὺς νομίσωμεν, ἀλλ' ἵνα δι' αὐτῶν Θεοὺς θεραπεύσωμεν—Ἡμᾶς ὄντας ἐν σώματι σωματικὰς ἰδεῖν πορεῖσθαι τοῖς Θεοῖς καὶ τὰς λατρείας—ἐκτερέθῃ γένος ἀγαλμάτων, εἰς δὲ τὰς θεραπείας ἐκτελούντες ἑαυτοῖς ευμενείας τοῖς Θεοῖς καταστήσωμεν. Ὡς περ γὰρ οἱ τῶν βασιλέων θεραπεύοντες σκῆνας οὐδὲν δεομένω, ὁμοίως ἐφέλκονται τὴν εὐνοαν εἰς ἑαυτοῦς, οὕτω καὶ οἱ Θεῶν θεραπευταὶ τὰ ἀγάλματα.

308 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

perors were pleased with the honour paid their images tho' they had no need of it. That part of the Apology was, in my opinion, as bad as the rest, but as no body has ever considered it as a proof of their not being sincere, I shall not insist on it, and content myself with observing, that (p) they took the whole form of their worship, and in particular the method of making and worshipping images, to have been *established by Revelation*, and consequently allowed themselves the liberty to argue about it no farther than as it might serve to apologize for it; *it not being possible fully to comprehend the reasons of what had been instituted by the Gods.*

III. The reasons assigned for multiplying the objects of Worship require a more particular discussion. As they mostly consisted in a bare exposition of the System of Polytheism, of which we have given an account in the beginning of this Dissertation, it is needless to repeat them in this place; but we cannot help taking notice of the pretended clashing of that exposition with the sincerity of the Philosophers. *The System of the Philosophers*, says F. La Bletterie, *was not that of the Multitude*: He might have added

(p) *Jul. ubi sup.* Ἀσώματοι δὲ εἰσιν αὐτοί. πρῶτα μὲν ἴδεσθαι ἡμῖν ἀγάλματα. *Jamblich. de Myst. sect. i. c. 21.* οὐχ αὐτὴ μὲν κατὰ θεσμούς θεῶν νοεῖς τε κατ' ἀρχὰς ἐνομοθετήσιν . . . ἀδύνατοι γὰρ ὄντες αὐτῶν οἱ ἀνθρώποι λογισμῶν τὴν γνῶσιν ἐπιλαβεῖν. See also *Gale's Notes* on this last place.

added that the Ph. did not give it for the System of the Multitude ; which had none, as indeed it seldom has any System. The Vulgar went in the tracks of their Ancestors, without caring much to know why, or to inquire who the Gods had been, and whether there was more than one of them adored under a certain name. The Multitude seldom carried their thoughts further than the Heroes, or Deified men, to whom they ascribed, without System or any Connection of Ideas, all they heard said of the Gods who had the same name ; but there is no instance of any one's having ever denied that there was a distinction. The Philosophers would have a systematical Religion, and by that means they became more Polytheists than the most ignorant Multitude ; because they † would neglect in their Worship none of those Beings whom, out of mistaken principles, they thought worthy of adoration. The Labourer, when he adored *Jupiter*, adored but one God. The Philosopher paid his Worship to the many Gods, either Heroes or meer intelligent Beings, whom he imagined to have been confounded under the same name. In all this I don't see how a confession of faith, which differed from that of the Vulgar, only because the latter was implicit, and the former particular, can be construed into a proof of insin-

† See *Jamblic.* Sect. v. c. 31.

310 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

cerity. The mean point is, that by their principles concerning the nature of human soul, and the possibility of its being Deified, a principle carried so far, that (+) *Julian* publicly declared his hopes of becoming a God, they were forced to acknowledge all the Hero-Gods of the Vulgar, tho' they had been otherwise inclined.

But, says one, *the Multitude adored vicious and abominable Beings, whom they acknowledged as such; and pretended to do honour to them by crimes.* I own I have been of opinion, ever since I have examined the Religion of the *Greek and Roman Heathen*, and I gave some hints of it in a book wrote sixteen years ago, that the Pagans are generally wrong'd in the pictures drawn by modern Christians; and the more I read, the more reason I find to think so still. The *Roman Catholics*, above all, blacken them so as to make a very real resemblance between themselves and the ancient Idolaters partly vanish away; but when the picture comes to be compared with the original, the unlikeness appears. Where is the proof that *the Multitude* acknowledged the Gods as vicious and abominable Beings? for I will not take a pretended *bon mot* of some libertine, who wanted to countenance his vices,

(+) He introduces the Sun thus speaking to him in the name of *Minerva, Mercury*, and all the other Gods as well as his own. *ἰσχυραὶς τε ἡμῶν ὅτι θεὸς ἔσθι.*

vices, for the Judgment of the Multitude. Woud to God there were none in Christian Countries who delight in making the same use of some places in Scripture! Tho' it was certain that the sober, I don't say the learned, Pagans never allegorized, could not they imagine that doing good to Mankind was so valuable a thing, that it had expiated those crimes which the Deified Benefactors of their Country had been guilty of? Where is the proof that *they attributed to the Sovereign God, in the person of Jupiter, all the infamous actions imaginable?* Jupiter was, at most, the first created God; but no body among the Pagans ever took him for the Self-existent Cause of all other Beings. As for the crimes which are said to have been committed in the worship of some Gods, we don't know how far the Philosophers might carry the Doctrine of a dispensing power, which every body allows to be part of the prerogative of the Deity. However, it is not proved that they held any Principles inconsistent with that Doctrine, and therefore they may have sincerely approved in the public Worship, (as being authorized by special Revelation) what they woud have blamed any where else. The question is not, whether they ought to have approved it; but whether it was inconsistent with their principles to do so, and I am sure the Systematical principles held by the *Platonists* concerning certain

certain adorable Beings, whom they imagined to be subject to human passions and whims, were as fit as any undigested notion of the ignorant Vulgar, to support a licentious Worship.

IV. But the heaviest part of the charge arises from the Philosophers apologizing for the Pagan Religion by denying the facts, or allegorizing the *stories*, which the Vulgar took to be literally true. They make three different attacks upon this method.

The first, (*viz.* that, by that means, the Religion apologized for, and that which was established by antient Laws and practised by the Multitude were two different Religions,) has been sufficiently considered in the place where we have examined the distinction between the *Esoteric* and the *Exoteric* Doctrine. Therefore we may now content ourselves with reminding the Reader, that belief was a part of the Heathenish Religion no farther than as it served to support the Worship of the Gods; and of consequence, wherever the difference in opinion did not affect the Worship, there was no difference of Religion.

The second bears directly against the Philosophers pretensions, that their notion of Paganism was the true notion, and ought to have been embraced by the Multitude.

(*q*) *They were in no way*, says F. La Bletterie,

(*q*) *Vie de Julien*, p. 24.

rie, of convincing the People that they had lost the spirit of their Religion, and that Paganism had been originally such as they endeavoured to represent it. Tho' it should be granted that the Philosophers were unable to make their assertion good, it would not follow that they were not sincere; but how doth it appear, that their allegation was not proved to the satisfaction of all the Pagans who examined the matter? For such as took no notice of it, and neither received nor rejected the Philosophical systems, don't deserve that we should take notice of them. Paganism had not then, nor ever had original records which contained its principles; no Law-giver, to whose writings they might appeal to reform abuses which arose in succeeding ages. If this be true, nothing could be reasonably required from them, but to give a probable conjectural account of the origin of their Religion; for where there is not and never has been original records, the field is open to conjectures. Would one require from the Philosophers to have produced books writ before the art of writing was invented? The probability of their conjectures is the only thing we have to examine; and, if they are not utterly impertinent, the Apologists of Paganism must be acquitted of the charge of having contrived them only to disguise what they inwardly condemned, tho' they outwardly retained it; for, with a prepossessed mind,

314 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

mind, the least degree of probability falls very short of a demonstration. Now their conjectures, which indeed they took to be so evident that they generally gave them for matter of fact, rested upon two principles so universally allowed, that there was no occasion for proving them. The first is thus expressed by *Julian* (r) *Nature is fond of secrecy, and the hidden essence of the Gods does not suffer itself to be laid open to unpurified bearers by naked words.* This he confirmed by two examples. 1st. The unaccountable efficacy of some characters for curing diseases, for purifying the soul, and for evocating the Gods. 2dly, The implicit instruction, for I can give it no other name, conveyed by the means of Theological fables. *I think, says he, that the same thing is often effected by Fables, when Divine instructions, which could not be otherwise purely received in the ears of the Multitude, are enigmatically poured into them with the cover of Fables.* The second principle is to be met with every where in Antiquity, and therefore particular quotations are not necessary. Their Ancestors were wise Men, who had done every thing they had meddled with in the best

(r) Φιλῆ γὰρ ἡ Φύσις κρύπτειν καὶ τὸ ἀποκρυπνυμένον τῆς τῶν Θεῶν οὐσίας οὐκ ἀνέχεται γυμνοῖς εἰς ἀκαθάρτους ἀκοῶς εἶπαι ῥήμασι. . . . τοῦτο ὁμῶς πολλὰκις γίνεσθαι, καὶ διὰ τῶν μύθων ὅταν εἰς τὰς τῶν πολλῶν ἀκοῶς οὐ δυναμένα τὰ θεῖα καθαρῶς δεῖξαι, δι' ἀνιγμάτων αὐτοῖς μετὰ τῆς μύθων σκηνωτοῦς ἰσχύεται. *Julian. Or. vii. p. 216.*

best manner possible. Thus, as they argued *a priori*, from the nature of the thing, they (s) were not obliged to produce original Records. If you objected the absurdities or improprieties of some Fables, they answered this very objection was a proof of the Mythologist's wisdom, for no better method could be thought of, to prevent Fables being mistaken for Truth. (t) *The more uncommon and surprising an enigma is, the plainer is the notice given that you must not believe the things therein recited, but look for the bidden sense, and not desist till you have found it by the help of the Gods. . . . When absurd Fables are told concerning Divine things, these very Fables loudly advertise us, and bear witness that we should not plainly believe, but look for, and dive to the bottom. Absurd Fables have that advantage over grave ones, that by the latter you run the danger of mistaking for Gods (u) (by nature) those who were good, great*

(s) Ουκέντι μαρτύρων παλαιῶν ἐν πᾶσι προσδιόμενοι. *ibid.*

P. 217.

(t) *Ibid.* Τὸ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς μύθοις ἀπεμφαῖνοι αὐτῶ τῇ προδοσῶσι, πρὸς τὴν ἀληθείαν, &c. p. 222. κατὰ μὲν τὴν διανοίαν ἀπεμφαίνοντες ὅταν οἱ μῦθοι γίνονται περὶ τῶν θεῶν, αὐτοὶ δὲ ἡμῖν ὥσπερ βῶσκον καὶ διαμαρτύρονται μὴ πιστεῖναι ἀπλῶς, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀληθὲς σκοπεῖν καὶ διερευνᾶσθαι. Τούτων δὲ ἐστὶ κρεῖττον ἐν τούτοις τῷ σέμνῳ τὸ ἀπεμφαῖνον, ὅσῳ διὰ μὴ ἰκύνει, καλὸς λίαν, καὶ μεγάλος, καὶ ἀγαθός, ἀνθρώπος δὲ ὅμως, τῆς θεᾶς κίνδυνος νομίσαι, &c.

(u) The Platonists carefully distinguished the Gods who were originally so, from the Deified men, who were

316 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

great and excellent, yet men; but by the former it may be hoped that, laying aside the obvious and literal sense, you will reach * their excellent essence and launch into all transcendent thoughts. Thus they pretended to demonstrate that the Authors of the Fables, and of the Ceremonies that had their foundation in the Fables, being wise Men, could not but have designed to make them Emblems; and it would have been to no purpose to tell them (x) prove once thoroughly that whatsoever is extravagant is symbolical and mysterious, for they pretended only that, when a wise Man's discourse is apparently absurd, we must go deeper to find out his meaning; but this is so evidently true that it needed no proof. The only question then was, whether the Inventors of Fables and Founders of the established Religion were wise men or no; but this was far from

were not properly *Gods*, tho' objects of worship, but *Heroes* or *Demons*.

* I leave here the ambiguity which I find in the original, τὴν ἐξουσίαν αὐτῶν οὐρανῶν not being able to determine whether *Julian* meant the essence of the Gods by Nature attained to by knowledge, or the essence of Deified Men attained to by becoming like them. However, this may confirm what has been said when we were upon the Mysteries, that by the secret Theology the Pagans were taught not to confound Deified Men with Beings of a superior Class, yet to look on them as good, great, and excellent, which could not be done without allegorizing some of the Poetical accounts.

(x) *Vie de Julien*. p. 25.

from being controverted by the Multitude. They were counted, I don't say by the Vulgar only, but by the very Philosophers, not only wise but even Inspired Men. *Orpheus, Bacchus, Numa, Minos*, are honoured with that title by *Julian*. *Plato* demonstrated the inspiration of Poets, by the excellency of their performances, who were, in all other respects, but ordinary Men: and *Socrates*, who seems to have been of the same opinion, thought it essential to a Poet to write Fables. From all this it is plain that the Multitude could not reject the Allegories of the Philosophers, and in fact it did not. If the Vulgar did not go into all their notions, it was for want of being apprized of them. But there is a great difference between not receiving what you know nothing of, and knowingly rejecting what is offered.

This may be carried farther, and I don't know what could be answered to one who would insist that the Apologists of Paganism were not only sincere, but right in the representation they made of the Origin of their Religion, (barring their pretensions to heavenly Revelations,) and had as good vouchers to warrant their accounts, as the nature of the thing could admit of. It is to no purpose to say they had *no Lawgiver to whose writings they might appeal*. To be sure Paganism had no single Lawgiver; for it was not a single Religion, but as Mr. *Warburton*

terms

318 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

terms it, (y) *an aggregate of several distinct Religions derived from so many pretended Revelations*; but it had as many Lawgivers as different forms of established worship; and the true design of those Founders was to be known, for the most part, rather from the secret Worship or Mysteries instituted by them in the Place where every God had been at first set up, than from books. Every body had not a free and uncontrouled access to those Mysteries; but every body was invited to make himself capable of being initiated; and it is very remarkable, that when the Apologists of Paganism have gone a certain length in allegorizing Mythology they often stop short, and tell you they can go no farther, because they are come to the verge of the Mysteries. Is not that a proof that they looked upon themselves as warranted by the knowledge acquired in those secret Rites, that had the same origin with the public ones, to put a figurative construction upon those Mythological accounts which had been handed down from the Founders of both? This may be confirmed from an observation of *Plutarch*, that *the Poets*, he means those who give you no hint of any thing besides the literal sense of the Fables, *seem to write purposely to contradict what the initiated learn in the celebration of the Mysteries*. Is not that saying plainly

plainly enough, that, in the Myſteries, one was taught not to acquieſce into the obvious ſenſe of the Fables?

The laſt objection againſt the Philoſophers ſincerity for allegorizing the Fables, and pretending thereby to apologize for Paganism, is that their interpretations could not remedy the evil done by the Fables, becauſe the generality of Men *will never ſtrain their thoughts to find out a hidden meaning at the expence of their paſſions, whilſt you preſent them with Emblems, which flatter their irregular appetites.* This obſervation may prove that the Apologiſts of Paganism fought for a bad cauſe; but it does not carry that they were ſenſible of its being bad. We have no Apology but what is compoſed upon Philoſophical principles, and therefore we cannot eaſily gueſs what they ſaid in behalf of the literal ſenſe of Fables who inſiſted on it, if any ever did. Yet we may ſuppoſe they availed themſelves of all the advantages which the literal ſenſe can afford. Who knows but they obſerved that the very Gods paid ſo dear for every act of vice they were guilty of, as appeared by their uneaſineſſes in certain circumſtances, and apprehenſions of revenge from other Gods, that Men, (who could not pretend to the ſame perogatives as the Gods,) ſhould be thereby warned to abſtain from crimes, and to follow virtue as the ſole

320 *The Philosophers sincere Heathen.*

sole way to happiness? Thus the Philosophers might have looked, even upon literal Paganism, in a more favourable light than we generally do. But this by the by, for indeed their sincerity may very well be reconciled with the most unfavourable notions of that kind of Paganism which they rejected. If they were, or thought themselves sure, as it appears they did, that the representations they made of their Religion were right, they were not answerable for the corruption of it. If the figurative meaning became obvious from the very absurdity of the literal sense, as they pretended it did, the Authors of the Fables and Founders of the Religious worship could not be answerable in their eyes for the dulness or perverseness of those who could not, or would not see what to them seemed evident.

Now to conclude this long Dissertation, it appears from all we have said that the accusation laid to the charge of all antient Philosophers, as if they had professed and practised, and of those in *Julian's* time, as if they had apologized for a Religion which they detested in their conscience, is groundless and in its first origin differed very little from calumny. A plain consequence of this is, that their efforts, for propping up the ruinous edifice of Paganism, was owing to a sincere tho' mistaken zeal, and I hope the Reader will

will take it for a confirmation of this Maxim, which, how opposite soever it may be to the prejudices of many, will hold true in most cases. Learned Men may be mistaken in their Notions; but they are generally sincere in their Profession.

F I N I S.

The Publisher's Office, London.

will take it for a confirmation of this
Matters: which, now, of the power of
may be of the power of the power of
hold true to the power of the power of
be mistaken in the power of the power of
Generally, the power of the power of



